arXiv:math/0301176v3 [math.AG] 10 Feb 2006

UHLENBECK SPACES VIA AFFINE LIE ALGEBRAS

ALEXANDER BRAVERMAN, MICHAEL FINKELBERG, AND DENNIS GAITSGORY

Abstract. Let G be an almost simple simply connected group over $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathbb{P}^1)$ be the moduli scheme of principal G-bundles on the projective plane $\mathbb{P}^2$, of second Chern class a, trivialized along a line $\mathbb{P}^1\subset\mathbb{P}^2$.

We define the Uhlenbeck compactification $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ of $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathbb{P}^1)$, which classifies, roughly, pairs $(\mathcal{F}_G,D)$, where D is a 0-cycle on $\mathbb{A}^2=\mathbb{P}^2-\mathbb{P}^1$ of degree b, and $\mathcal{F}_G$ is a point of $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathbb{P}^1)$, for varying b.

In addition, we calculate the stalks of the Intersection Cohomology sheaf of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$. To do that we give a geometric realization of Kashiwara's crystals for affine Kac-Moody algebras.

Introduction

0.1. Let G be an almost simple simply connected group over $\mathbb{C}$, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, and let $\mathbf{S}$ be a smooth projective surface.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S})$ the moduli space (stack) of principal G-bundles on $\mathbf{S}$ of second Chern class a. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S})$ cannot be compact, and the source of the non-compactness can be explained as follows:

By checking the valuative criterion of properness, we arrive to the following situation: we are given a G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ on a 3-dimensional variety $\mathcal{X}$ defined away from a point, and we would like to extend it to the entire $\mathcal{X}$. However, such an extension does not always exist, and the obstruction is given by a positive integer, which one can think of as the second Chern class of the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_G$ to a suitable 4-sphere corresponding to the point x.

However, this immediately suggests how a compactification of $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S})$ could look like: it should be a union

$$\bigcup_{b\in\mathbb{N}}\mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbf{S})\times\mathrm{Sym}^b(\mathbf{S}). \tag{1}$$

In the differential-geometric framework of moduli spaces of K-instantons on Riemannian 4-manifolds (where K is the maximal compact subgroup of G) such a compactification was introduced in the pioneering work [U]. Therefore, we shall call its algebro-geometric version the Uhlenbeck space, and denote it by $\mathfrak{U}_G^a(\mathbf{S})$.

Unfortunately, one still does not know how to construct the spaces $\mathfrak{U}_G^a(\mathbf{S})$ for a general group G and an arbitrary surface $\mathbf{S}$. More precisely, one would like to formulate a moduli problem, to which $\mathfrak{U}_G^a(\mathbf{S})$ would be the answer, and so far this is not known. In this formulation the question of constructing the Uhlenbeck spaces has been posed (to the best of our knowledge) by V. Ginzburg. He and V. Baranovsky (cf. [BaGi]) have made the first attempts to solve it, as well as indicated the approach adopted in this paper.

A significant simplification occurs for $G=SL_n$. Let us note that when $G=SL_n$, there exists another natural compactification of the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_n^a(\mathbf{S}):=\mathrm{Bun}_{SL_n}^a(\mathbf{S})$, by torsion-free sheaves of generic rank n and of second Chern class a, called the Gieseker compactification,

Date: October 2004.

which in this paper we will denote by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n(\mathbf{S})$. One expects that there exists a proper map $\mathsf{f}: \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n(\mathbf{S}) \to \mathfrak{U}^a_{SL_n}(\mathbf{S})$, described as follows:

A torsion-free sheaf $\mathcal{M}$ embeds into a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}' \to \mathcal{M}_0 \to 0,$$

where $\mathcal{M}'$ is a vector bundle (called the saturation of $\mathcal{M}$), and $\mathcal{M}_0$ is a finite-length sheaf. The map should send a point of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n(\mathbf{S})$ corresponding to $\mathcal{M}$ to the pair $(\mathcal{M}', \mathrm{cycle}(\mathcal{M}_0)) \in \mathrm{Bun}^{a-b}_n(\mathbf{S}) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\mathbf{S})$, where b is the length of $\mathcal{M}_0$, and $\mathrm{cycle}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ is the cycle of $\mathcal{M}_0$. In other words, the map must "collapse" the information of the quotient $\mathcal{M}' \to \mathcal{M}_0$ to just the information of the length of $\mathcal{M}_0$ at various points of $\mathbf{S}$.

Since the spaces $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n(\mathbf{S})$, being a solution of a moduli problem, are easy to construct, one may attempt to construct the Uhlenbeck spaces $\mathfrak{U}^a_{SL_n}(\mathbf{S})$ by constructing an explicit blow down of the Gieseker spaces $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n(\mathbf{S})$. This has indeed been performed in the works of J. Li (cf. [Li]) and J. W. Morgan (cf. [Mo]).

The problem simplifies even further, when we put $\mathbf{S} = \mathbb{P}^2$, the projective plane, and consider bundles trivialized along a fixed line $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. In this case, the sought-for space $\mathfrak{U}^a_n(\mathbf{S})$ has been constructed by S. Donaldson (cf. Chapter 3 of [DK]) and thoroughly studied by H. Nakajima (cf. e.g. [Na]) in his works on quiver varieties.

In the present paper, we will consider the case of an arbitrary group G, but the surface equal to $\mathbb{P}^2$ (and we will be interested in bundles trivialized along $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, i.e., we will work in the Donaldson-Nakajima set-up.)

We will be able to construct the Uhlenbeck spaces $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, but only up to nilpotents. I.e., we will have several definitions, two of which admit modular descriptions, and which produce the same answer on the level of reduced schemes. We do not know, whether the resulting schemes actually coincide when we take the nilpotents into account. And neither do we know whether the resulting reduced scheme is normal.

We should say that the problem of constructing the Uhlenbeck spaces can be posed over a base field of any characteristic. However, the proof of one of the main results of this paper, Theorem 4.8, which insures that our spaces $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ are invariantly defined, uses the char.=0 assumption. It is quite possible that in order to treat the char.=p case, one needs a finer analysis.

0.2. The construction of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ used in this paper is a simplification of a suggestion of Drinfeld's (the latter potentially works for an arbitrary surface $\mathbf{S}$).

We are trying to express points of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ (one may call them quasi-bundles) by replacing the original problem for the surface $\mathbb{P}^2$, or rather for a rationally equivalent surface $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, by another problem for the curve $\mathbb{P}^1$.

As a motivation, let us consider the following simpler situation. Let $\mathcal{M}^0$ be the trivial rank-2 bundle on a curve $\mathbf{C}$. A flag in $\mathcal{M}^0$ is by definition a line subbundle $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{M}^0$, or equivalently a map from $\mathbf{C}$ to the flag variety of GL_2, i.e. $\mathbb{P}^1$.

However, there is a natural generalization of a notion of a flag, also suggested by Drinfeld: instead of line *subbundles* we may consider all pairs $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{M}^0)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is still a line bundle, but κ need not be a bundle map, just an embedding of coherent sheaves. We define a *quasi-map* $\mathbf{C} \to \mathbb{P}^1$ (generalizing the notion of a *map*) to be such a pair $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$.

In fact, one can introduce the notion of a quasi-map from a curve (or any projective variety) $\mathbf{C}$ to another projective variety $\mathcal{T}$. When $\mathcal{T}$ is the flag variety of a semi-simple group G, the corresponding quasi-maps spaces have been studied in [FFKM], [BG1], [BFGM].

Our construction of the Uhlenbeck space is based on considering quasi-maps from $\mathbb{P}^1$ (thought of as a "horizontal" component of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$) to various flag varieties associated to the loop group of G, among them the most important are Kashiwara's thick Grassmannian, and the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian Gr_G^{BD}.

The spaces of maps and quasi-maps from a projective curve $\mathbf{C}$ to Kashiwara's flag schemes are of independent interest and have been another major source of motivation for us.

In [FFKM], [FKMM] it was shown that if one considers the space of (based) maps, of multi-degree μ, from $\mathbf{C}$ to the flag variety of a finite-dimensional group G, one obtains an affine scheme, which we denote by $\mathrm{Maps}^\mu(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{g})$, endowed with a symplectic structure, and which admits a Lagrangian projection to the space of coloured divisors on $\mathbf{C}$, denoted $\mathbf{C}^\mu$.

Moreover, the irreducible components of the *central fiber* $\mathfrak{F}_\mathfrak{g}^\mu$ of this projection (i.e. the fiber over $\mu \cdot \mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}^\mu$, for some point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$) form in a natural way a basis for the μ-weight piece of $U(\check{\mathfrak{n}})$, where $\check{\mathfrak{g}} \supset \check{\mathfrak{n}}$ are the Langlands dual Lie algebra and its maximal nilpotent subalgebra, respectively.

One may wonder if this picture can be generalized for an arbitrary Kac-Moody $\mathfrak{g}'$, instead of the finite-dimensional algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. We discuss such a generalization in Parts I and IV of this paper. We formulate Conjecture 2.27, which is subsequently proven for $\mathfrak{g}'$ affine (and, of course, finite), which allows to define on the set of irreducible components of the central fibers $\underset{\mu}{\cup} \mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{g}'}^\mu$ a structure of Kashiwara's crystal, and thereby link it to the combinatorics of the Langlands dual Lie algebra $\check{\mathfrak{g}}'$.

In particular, when $\mathfrak{g}'$ is affine, the space $\mathrm{Maps}^\mu(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$ turns out to be closely related to the space of bundles on $\mathbb{P}^2$, and the space of quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}^\mu(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}'})$ — to the corresponding Uhlenbeck space. The relation between the irreducible components of $\mathfrak{F}^\mu$ and the Lie algebra $\check{\mathfrak{g}}'$ mentioned above, allows us to explicitly compute the Intersection Cohomology sheaf on $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, and express it in terms of $\check{\mathfrak{g}}'$ (in this case $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}_{aff}$, the affinization of $\mathfrak{g}$.)

0.3. The two main results of this paper are construction of the scheme $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, so that it has the stratification as in (1) (Theorem 7.2), and the explicit description of the Intersection Cohomology sheaf of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ (Theorem 7.10). Let us now explain the logical structure of the paper and the main points of each of the parts.

Part I is mostly devoted to the preliminaries. In Section 1 we introduce the notion of a quasi-map (in rather general circumstances) and prove some of its basic properties. The reader familiar with any of the works [FFKM], [BG1] or [BFGM] may skip Section 1 and return for proofs of statements referred to in the subsequent sections.

In Section 2 we collect some facts about Kashiwara's flag schemes $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{p}}$ for a general Kac-Moody Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}'$, and study the quasi-maps' spaces from a curve $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{p}}$. In the main body of the paper we will only use the cases when $\mathfrak{g}'$ is the affine algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$, or the initial finite-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

In Section 3 we collect some basic facts about G-bundles on a surface $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ trivialized along the divisor of infinity.

In Part II we introduce the Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ and study its properties. In Section 4 we give three definitions of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, of which two are almost immediately equivalent, and the equivalence with the (most invariant) third one is established later.

Section 5 contains a proof of Theorem 5.12, (conjectured in [FGK]) about the isomorphism of our definition of the Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}_{SL_n}^a$ with Donaldson's one. The proof follows the ideas indicated by Drinfeld.

In Section 6 we prove some additional functoriality properties of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, which, combined with the Theorem 5.12 of the previous section, yields Theorem 4.8 about the equivalence of all three definitions from Section 4. In addition, in Section 6 we establish the factorization property of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ with respect to the projection on the symmetric power $\mathbb{A}^{(a)}$ of the "horizontal" line, which will be one of the principal technical tools in the study of the geometry of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, and in particular, for the computation of the IC sheaf.

In Section 7 we prove Theorem 7.2 saying that $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ indeed has a stratification as in (1). In addition, we formulate Theorem 7.10 describing the stalks of the IC sheaf on the various strata.

In Section 8 we present two moduli problems, whose solutions provide two more variants of the definition of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, and which coincide with the original one on the level of reduced schemes.

In Part III we define "parabolic" version of Uhlenbeck spaces, $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G,P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G,P}$, which are two different compactifications of the space $\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$, classifying G-bundles on $\mathbb{P}^2$ with a trivialization along a divisor $\mathbb{P}^1 \simeq \mathbf{D}_\infty \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, and a reduction to a parabolic P along another divisor $\mathbb{P}^1 \simeq \mathbf{D}_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Introducing these more general spaces is necessary for our calculation of stalks of the IC sheaf.

Thus, in Section 9 we give the definition of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G,P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G,P}$, and establish the corresponding factorization properties.

In Section 10, we prove Theorem 10.2 that describes the stratifications of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G,P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G,P}$ parallel to those of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

In Section 11, we prove an important geometric property of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G,P}$ when $P = B$ saying that its *boundary* (in a natural sense) is a Cartier divisor.

In Part IV we make a digression and discuss a construction of crystals (in the sense of Kashiwara), using the quasi-maps spaces $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{p}})$ introduced in Section 2, for an arbitrary Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}'$. Unfortunately, to make this construction work one has to assume a certain geometric property of the $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{p}})$ spaces, Conjecture 2.27, which we verify in Sect. 15.6 for $\mathfrak{g}'$ of affine type, using some geometric properties of the parabolic Uhlenbeck's spaces. As was mentioned above, it is via Kashiwara's crystals, more precisely using Theorem 12.8, that we relate the IC stalks on $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ and the Lie algebra $\check{\mathfrak{g}}_{aff}$.

In Section 12 we recollect some general facts about Kashiwara's crystals. In particular, we review what properties are necessary to prove that a given crystal $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}'}$ is isomorphic to the standard crystal $\mathsf{B}^\infty_{\mathfrak{g}'}$ of [Ka5].

In Section 13 we take our Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}'$ to be finite dimensional and spell out our "new" construction of crystals using the affine Grassmannian of the corresponding group G.

In Section 14 we consider the case of a general Kac-Moody algebra, and essentially repeat the construction of the previous section using the scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{p}})$ instead of the affine Grassmannian.

In Section 15 we verify Conjecture 2.27 and Conjecture 15.3 for finite-dimensional and affine Lie algebras, which insures that in these cases the crystal of the previous section is well-defined and can be identified with the standard crystal $\mathsf{B}^\infty_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

In Part V we perform the calculation of the IC sheaf on the schemes $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G,P}$ and $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G,P}$.

In Section 16 we formulate four theorems, which describe the behavior of the IC sheaf, and in Section 17 we prove all the four statements by an inductive argument borrowed from [BFGM].

Finally, in the Appendix we reproduce a theorem of A. Joseph, formulated in Part I, Section 2, which says that the space of based maps $\mathbf{C} \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{p}}$ of given degree is a scheme of finite type for any Kac-Moody Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}'$.

0.4. **Acknowledgements.** It is clear from the above discussion that the present paper owes its existence to V. Drinfeld's generous explanations. We have also benefited strongly from discussions with V. Baranovsky and V. Ginzburg. In fact, the idea that the Uhlenbeck space must be related to the space of quasi-maps into the affine Grassmannian was formulated by V.Ginzburg back in 1997.

In the course of our study of Uhlenbeck spaces, M.F. has enjoyed the hospitality and support of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the University of Chicago, and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. His research was conducted for the Clay Mathematical Institute, and partially supported by the CRDF award RM1-2545-MO-03.

D.G. is a prize fellow of the Clay Mathematics Institute. He also wishes to thank the Hebrew University of Jerusalem where the major part of this paper was written.

We would also like to thank the referee for helpful remarks.

Part I: Preliminaries on quasi-maps

1. Maps and quasi-maps

1.1. The simplest framework in which one defines the notion of quasi-map is the following:

Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a projective scheme, $\mathcal{E}$ a vector space, and $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ a closed subscheme.

There exists a scheme, which we will denote $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ that represents the functor that assigns to a test scheme S the set of maps $\mathcal{Y} \times S \to \mathcal{T}$.

To show the representability, it is enough to assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is the entire $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ (since in general $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ is evidently a closed subfunctor in $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$), and in the latter case our functor can be rewritten as pairs $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle on $\mathcal{Y} \times S$, and κ is an injective bundle map

$$\kappa : \mathcal{L} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathcal{E}.$$

Therefore, we are dealing with an open subset of a suitable Hilbert scheme. The scheme $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ splits as a disjoint union of subschemes, denoted $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$, and indexed by set of connected components of the Picard stack $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{Y})$ of $\mathcal{Y}$ (our normalization is such that $\sigma = (\mathcal{L}, \kappa) \in \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ if $\mathcal{L}^{-1} \in \mathrm{Pic}^a(\mathcal{Y})$), and each $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ is a quasi-projective scheme.

We will introduce a bigger scheme, denoted $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$, which contains $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ as an open subscheme. First, we will consider the case of $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$.

By definition, $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$ represents the functor that assigns to a scheme S the set of pairs $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle on the product $\mathcal{Y} \times S$ belonging to the connected component $\mathrm{Pic}^{-a}(\mathcal{Y})$ of the Picard stack, and κ is an *injective map of coherent sheaves*

$$\kappa : \mathcal{L} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathcal{E},$$

such that the quotient is S-flat. (The latter condition is equivalent to the fact that for every geometric point $s \in S$, the restriction of κ to $\mathcal{Y} \times s$ is injective.) This functor is also representable by a quasi-projective scheme, for the same reason.

Let now $\mathcal{T}$ be arbitrary, and let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} = \underset{n \geq 0}{\oplus} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}^n \subset \mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{E}^*)$ be the corresponding graded ideal. We define the closed subscheme $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}) \subset \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$ by the condition that for every n the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}^n \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^n(\mathcal{E}^*) \to (\mathcal{L}^{-1})^{\otimes n}$$

vanishes.

We will denote by $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ the union of $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ over all connected components of $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathcal{Y})$.

In the main body of the present paper the scheme $\mathcal{Y}$ will be a smooth algebraic curve, but for completeness in this section we will consider the general case. Note that in the case of curves, the parameter a amounts to an integer, normalized to be the negative of $\deg(\mathcal{L})$.

In the rest of this section we will study various properties and generalizations of the notion of a quasi-map introduced above.

1.2. **Variant.** Assume for a moment that $\mathcal{Y}$ is integral. Observe that if $\sigma = (\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$ is an S-point of $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$, there exists an open dense subset $U \subset \mathcal{Y} \times S$, over which κ is a bundle map.

Consider the (automatically closed) subfunctor of $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$, corresponding to the condition that the resulting *map* $U \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ factors through $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. It is easy to see that this subfunctor coincides with $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$.

The above definition can be also spelled out as follows. Let $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ be the affine cone over $\mathcal{T}$, i.e. the closure in $\mathcal{E}$ of the preimage of $\mathcal{T}$ under the natural map $(\mathcal{E} - 0) \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. The multiplicative group $\mathbb{G}_m$ acts naturally on $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ and we can form the stack $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})/\mathbb{G}_m$, which contains $\mathcal{T}$ as an open substack.

It is easy to see that a map $S \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ is the same as a map $\sigma : \mathcal{Y} \times S \to C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})/\mathbb{G}_m$, such that for every geometric $s \in S$, the map $\mathcal{Y} \simeq \mathcal{Y} \times s \to C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})/\mathbb{G}_m$ sends the generic point of $\mathcal{Y}$ into $\mathcal{T}$.

We will now introduce a still bigger scheme, $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$. First, $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$ is the scheme, classifying pairs $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is an S-flat coherent sheaf on $\mathcal{Y} \times S$, whose restriction to every geometric fiber $\mathcal{Y} \times s$ is of generic rank 1, and κ is a map of coherent sheaves, injective at each $Y \times s$ (as above $s \in S$ denotes a geometric point). The superscript p signifies that the Hilbert polynomial p of $\mathcal{L}$ (with respect to some ample line bundle on $\mathcal{Y}$) is fixed. Omitting the superscript means that we are taking the union over all possible Hilbert polynomials.

As in the case of $\mathrm{QMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$, given an S-point $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$ of $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$, there exists an open dense subset $U \subset \mathcal{Y} \times S$, over which $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle, and κ is a bundle map.

For a closed subscheme $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, we defined the closed subfunctor $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ of $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$ by the condition that the resulting map $U \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ factors through $\mathcal{T}$.

Since $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$ is actually the entire Hilbert scheme, we obtain:

Lemma 1.3. *The scheme* $\mathrm{QQMaps}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}); \mathcal{E})$ *is proper.*

Note that by assumption, for every geometric point $s \in S$, the restriction $\mathcal{L}_s := \mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{Y} \times s}$ embeds into $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}$; therefore, $\mathcal{L}$ is torsion-free. In particular, when $\mathcal{Y}$ is a smooth curve, $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ coincides with $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$. But in general we have an open embedding $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$.

Proposition 1.4. *Suppose* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is smooth. Then the scheme* $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ *is proper as well.*

Proof. Let us check the valuative criterion of properness. Using Lemma 1.3 we can assume having the following set-up:

Let $\mathbf{X}$ be a curve with a marked point $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a torsion-free coherent sheaf on $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathbf{X}$, embedded into $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathbf{X}}$, and such that $\mathcal{L}|_{\mathcal{Y} \times (\mathbf{X} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})}$ is a line bundle.

We claim that $\mathcal{L}$ itself is a line bundle. Indeed, $\mathcal{L}$ is locally free outside of codimension 2, and since $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathbf{X}$ is smooth, it admits a saturation, i.e. there exists a unique line bundle $\mathcal{L}^0$ containing $\mathcal{L}$, such that $\mathcal{L}^0/\mathcal{L}$ is supported in codimension 2. Moreover, it is easy to see that the map $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathbf{X}}$ extends to a map $\mathcal{L}^0 \to \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathbf{X}}$. But since the cokernel of κ was $\mathbf{X}$-flat, we obtain that $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}^0$ must be an isomorphism.

□

In particular, we see that when $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth, $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ is the union of certain of the connected components of $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$.

1.5. **Based quasi-maps.** Let $\mathcal{Y}'\subset\mathcal{Y}$ be a closed subscheme, and $\sigma':\mathcal{Y}'\to\mathcal{T}$ a fixed map. We introduce the scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Y}',\sigma'}$ as a (locally closed) subfunctor of $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ defined by the following two conditions:

- The restriction of the map κ to $\mathcal{Y}'\times S$ is a *bundle map*. (Equivalently, the quotient $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{L}$ is locally free in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{Y}'\times S$.)
- The the resulting map $\mathcal{Y}'\times S\to\mathcal{T}$ equals $\mathcal{Y}'\times S\to\mathcal{Y}'\overset{\sigma'}{\to}\mathcal{T}$.

When $\mathcal{Y}$ is integral, one defines in a similar way the subscheme

$$\mathrm{QQMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Y}',\sigma'}\subset\mathrm{QQMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}).$$

The following assertion will be needed in the main body of the paper: Assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is a smooth curve $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathcal{Y}'$ is a point $\mathbf{c}$, so that $\sigma':pt\to\mathcal{T}$ corresponds to some point of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 1.6. *There exists an affine map* $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathbf{c},\sigma'}\to(\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c})^{(a)}$. *In particular, the scheme* $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathbf{c},\sigma'}$ *is affine.*

Proof. We can assume that $\mathcal{T}=\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, so that σ' corresponds to a line $\ell\subset\mathcal{E}$. Let us choose a splitting $\mathcal{E}\simeq\mathcal{E}'\oplus\ell$.

Then we have a natural map $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{E})_{\mathbf{c},\sigma'}\to(\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c})^{(a)}$, that assigns to a pair $(\mathcal{L},\kappa:\mathcal{L}\to\mathcal{O}\otimes\mathcal{E})$ the divisor of zeroes of the composition $\mathcal{L}\to\mathcal{O}\otimes\mathcal{E}\to\mathcal{O}\otimes\ell\simeq\mathcal{O}$.

Since $\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c}$ is affine, the symmetric power $(\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c})^{(a)}$ is affine as well. We claim that the above morphism $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{E})_{\mathbf{c},\sigma'}\to(\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c})^{(a)}$ is also affine.

Indeed, given a divisor $D\in(\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c})^{(a)}$, the fiber of $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{E})_{\mathbf{c},\sigma'}$ over it is the vector space $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-D),\mathcal{E}')$.

□

1.7. **The relative version.** Suppose now that $\mathcal{Y}$ itself is a flat family of projective schemes over some base $\mathcal{X}$, and $\mathcal{E}$ is a vector bundle on $\mathcal{Y}$, with $\mathcal{T}\subset\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ a closed subscheme.

The scheme of maps $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T})$ assigns to a test scheme S over $\mathcal{X}$ the set of maps $\sigma:\mathcal{Y}\underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times}S\to\mathcal{T}$, such that the composition $\mathcal{Y}\underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times}S\to\mathcal{T}\to\mathcal{Y}$ is the projection on the first factor. By definition, $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T})$ is also a scheme over $\mathcal{X}$.

By essentially repeating the construction of Sect. 1.1, we obtain a scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$, which is quasi-projective over $\mathcal{X}$.

As before, if $\mathcal{Y}'\subset\mathcal{Y}$ is a closed subscheme, flat over $\mathcal{X}$, and $\sigma':\mathcal{Y}'\to\mathcal{T}$ is a $\mathcal{X}$-map, we can define a locally closed subscheme $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Y}',\sigma'}$ of based maps. When $\mathcal{Y}\to\mathcal{X}$ has integral fibers, one can define the relative versions of $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Y}',\sigma'}$ in a similar fashion.

In what follows, we will mostly discuss the "absolute" case, leaving the (straightforward) modifications required in the relative and based cases to the reader.

1.8. Next we will study some functorial properties of the quasi-maps' spaces. From now on we will assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is integral.

For $\mathcal{T}\subset\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ as above, let $\mathcal{P}$ be the very ample line bundle $\mathcal{O}(1)|_{\mathcal{T}}$. Note that we have a map $H^0(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{P})^*\to\mathcal{E}$.

Let now $\mathcal{T}_1 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)$ and $\mathcal{T}_2 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ be two projective schemes, and $\phi : \mathcal{T}_1 \to \mathcal{T}_2$ be a map, such that $\phi^*(\mathcal{P}_2) \simeq \mathcal{P}_1$. Assume, moreover, that the corresponding map $H^0(\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{P}_2) \to H^0(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{P}_1)^*$ is extended to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{P}_1)^* & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{P}_2)^* \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E}_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_2. \end{array}$$

Lemma 1.9. *Under the above circumstances the morphism* $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1) \to \mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2)$ *extends to a Cartesian diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2). \end{array}$$

Proof. The existence of the map $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$ is nearly obvious from the interpretation of quasi-maps as maps to the affine cone:

Note that the condition of the lemma is equivalent to the fact that the map $\mathcal{T}_1 \to \mathcal{T}_2$ is extended to a commutative diagram of the corresponding affine cones:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{T}_1 & \longleftarrow & C(\mathcal{T}_1; \mathcal{E}_1) - 0 & \longrightarrow & C(\mathcal{T}_1; \mathcal{E}_1) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{T}_2 & \longleftarrow & C(\mathcal{T}_2; \mathcal{E}_2) - 0 & \longrightarrow & C(\mathcal{T}_2; \mathcal{E}_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_2. \end{array}$$

Therefore, we can just compose a map $\mathcal{Y} \times S \to C(\mathcal{T}_1; \mathcal{E}_1)/\mathbb{G}_m$ with the map $C(\mathcal{T}_1; \mathcal{E}_1)/\mathbb{G}_m \to C(\mathcal{T}_2; \mathcal{E}_2)/\mathbb{G}_m$.

Let us construct the map $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$. Given a scheme S, and a coherent sheaf of generic rank 1 $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{Y} \times S$ with a map $\kappa_1 : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathcal{E}_1$, let us consider the composition

$$\kappa_2 : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y} \times S} \otimes \mathcal{E}_2.$$

We claim that the restriction of κ_2 to every fiber $\mathcal{Y} \times s$ is still injective. Indeed, we are dealing with a map $\mathcal{L}_s \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \otimes \mathcal{E}_2$, which is injective over an open subset of $\mathcal{Y}$ (because on some open subset U, κ_2 corresponds to a *map* $U \to \mathcal{T}_2$), and we know that $\mathcal{L}_s$ is torsion free.

The square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2). \end{array}$$

is Cartesian, because being in QMaps is just the condition that $\mathcal{L}$ is locally free.

To prove that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2). \end{array}$$

is Cartesian, we have to show that if $\mathrm{coker}(\kappa_2)$ is locally free, then so is $\mathrm{coker}(\kappa_1)$. But this follows from the 4-term exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S} \otimes \ker(\mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathcal{E}_2) \to \mathrm{coker}(\kappa_1) \to \mathrm{coker}(\kappa_2) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S} \otimes \mathrm{coker}(\mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathcal{E}_2) \to 0.$$

□

This lemma has a straightforward generalization to the based case:

If we fix $\mathcal{Y}'$ and $\sigma_1' : \mathcal{Y}' \to \mathcal{T}_1$ with $\sigma_2' := \phi \circ \sigma_1'$, we have a Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1)_{\mathcal{Y}', \sigma_1'} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2)_{\mathcal{Y}', \sigma_2'} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2), \end{array}$$

and similarly, for QQMaps.

Assume now that we are in the situation of Lemma 1.9, and that the map $\mathcal{T}_1 \to \mathcal{T}_2$ is a closed embedding.

Proposition 1.10. *Under the above circumstances, the resulting morphisms*

$$\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2) \text{ and } \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$$

are closed embeddings.

If $\mathcal{T}_1 \to \mathcal{T}_2$ is an isomorphism, and $\mathcal{Y}$ is normal then the morphism $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$ induces an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes.

(Due to the Cartesian diagram above, the same assertions will hold in the based situation.)

Proof. If $\mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathcal{E}_2$ is an isomorphism, then the assertion of the lemma is obvious, as both schemes are closed subschemes in $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_2)$ (resp., $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_2)$). Therefore, we can assume that $\mathcal{T}_1 \simeq \mathcal{T}_2 =: \mathcal{T}$.

First, we claim that the map

$$\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_1)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_2))$$

is an injection for any scheme S.

This follows from the fact that if $\mathcal{L}$ is a torsion-free coherent sheaf on $\mathcal{Y} \times S$, then any two maps $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S} \otimes \mathcal{E}_1$ that coincide over a dense subset $U \subset \mathcal{Y} \times S$, must coincide globally.

Since the scheme $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_1)$ is proper, the map

$$\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_2)$$

is proper. Combined with the previous statement, we obtain that it is a closed embedding. Using the Cartesian diagrams of Lemma 1.9, we obtain that $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_1) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_2)$ is a closed embedding as well.

To prove the last assertion, we claim that for any normal scheme S, the map

$$\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_1)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_2))$$

is in fact a bijection. Indeed, let us consider the map between the cones $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}_1) \to C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}_2)$. This map is finite, and is an isomorphism away from $0 \in C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}_2)$.

For a given element in $\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_2))$, consider the Cartesian product

$$(\mathcal{Y} \times S) \underset{C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_2)/\mathbb{G}_m}{\times} C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}_1)/\mathbb{G}_m.$$

This is a scheme, finite and generically isomorphic to $\mathcal{Y} \times S$. Since $\mathcal{Y} \times S$ is normal, we obtain that it admits a section, i.e. we have a map $\mathcal{Y} \times S \to C(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}_1)/\mathbb{G}_m$.

□

1.11. The definition of quasi-maps given above depends on the projective embedding of $\mathcal{T}$. In fact, one can produce another scheme, which depends only on the corresponding very ample line bundle $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{O}(1)|_{\mathcal{T}}$. Note that for the discussion below it is crucial that we work with QMaps and not QQMaps, because we will be taking tensor products of the corresponding line bundles.

For a test scheme S, we let $\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}))$ be the set consisting of pairs $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is, as before, a line bundle on $\mathcal{Y} \times S$, and κ is a map $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S} \otimes \Gamma(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P})^*$, which extends to a map of algebras

$$\underset{n}{\oplus} H^0(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n}) \to \underset{n}{\oplus} (\mathcal{L}^*)^{\otimes n},$$

and such that κ is injective over every geometric point $s \in S$. (This definition makes sense for an arbitrary, i.e. not necessarily integral scheme $\mathcal{Y}$.)

Resuming the assumption that $\mathcal{Y}$ is integral, we can spell out the above definition as follows. Let $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})$ be the affine closure of the total space of $(\mathcal{P}^{-1} - 0)$, i.e. $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})$ is the spectrum of the algebra $\underset{n}{\oplus} H^0(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n})$. We can form the stack $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})/\mathbb{G}_m$, which contains $\mathcal{T}$ as an open subset.

As before, we can consider the functor $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})$ that assigns to a scheme S the set of maps $\mathcal{Y} \times S \to C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})/\mathbb{G}_m$, such that for every geometric point $s \in S$, the map $\mathcal{Y} \simeq \mathcal{Y} \times s \to C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})/\mathbb{G}_m$ sends the generic point of $\mathcal{Y}$ into $\mathcal{T}$.

Proposition 1.12. *For $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathcal{P}$ as above we have*

(a) *There is a canonical morphism* $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$. *When $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth, this map is a closed embedding, which induces an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes.*

(b) *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a morphism* $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n})$. *When $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth, this map is also a closed embedding, which induces an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes.*

(c) *If $\phi : \mathcal{T}_1 \to \mathcal{T}_2$ is a map of projective schemes, such that $\phi^*(\mathcal{P}_2) \simeq \mathcal{P}_1$, we have a morphism* $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}_1) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}_2)$, *which is a closed embedding, whenever ϕ is.*

Proof. Observe that we have a finite map $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}) \to C(\mathcal{T}; H^0(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P})^*)$, and moreover, for any positive integer n, a finite map $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}) \to C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n})$. This makes the existence of the maps $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ and $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n})$ obvious.

For k large enough, the map of $C(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})$ into the product $\underset{i=1,\ldots,k}{\Pi} C(\mathcal{T}; H^0(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}^{\otimes i})^*)$ is a closed embedding. Hence $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})$ is representable by a closed subscheme in the product $\underset{i=1,\ldots,k}{\Pi} \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; H^0(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}^{\otimes i})^*)$.

In particular, when $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth, we obtain that $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})$ is proper.

To finish the proof of the proposition, it would suffice to show that for a test scheme S, the maps $\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})) \to \mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}))$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P})) \to \mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n}))$ are injective and are, moreover, bijective if S is normal. This is done exactly as in the proof of Lemma 1.10.

Assertion (c) of the Proposition follows from Lemma 1.9 and Lemma 1.10.

□

Point (c) of the above proposition allows to define $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{P})$ as a strict ind-scheme, when $\mathcal{T}$ is a strict ind-projective ind-scheme endowed with a very ample line bundle.

Indeed, if $\mathcal{T}=\underset{\rightarrow}{lim}\,\mathcal{T}_i$, where $\mathcal{T}_i$ are projective schemes, and $\mathcal{T}_i\to\mathcal{T}_j$ are closed embeddings, and $\mathcal{P}_i$ is a compatible system of line bundles on $\mathcal{T}_i$, we have a system of closed embeddings

$$\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}_i;\mathcal{P}_i)\to\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}_j;\mathcal{P}_j).$$

In this section we will discuss the quasi-maps' spaces in their $\mathrm{Hom}(S,\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}))$ incarnation. The $\mathrm{Hom}(S,\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{P}))$-versions of the corresponding results are obtained similarly.

1.13. Suppose now that we have an embedding $\mathcal{T}\subset\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)\times...\times\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_k)$. In this situation for a k-tuple $\overline{a}$ of parameters a_i we can introduce a scheme of quasi-maps:

We first define $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\overline{a}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)\times...\times\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_k);\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)$ simply as the product

$$\prod_i \mathrm{QMaps}^{a_i}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_i)).$$

For an arbitrary $\mathcal{T}$, which corresponds to a multi-graded ideal

$$\bigoplus_{n_1,...,n_k}\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}^{n_1,...,n_k}\subset\mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{E}_1^*)\otimes...\otimes\mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{E}_n^*),$$

we set $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\overline{a}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)$ to be the closed subscheme in $\prod_i \mathrm{QMaps}^{a_i}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_i))$, defined by the condition that for each n-tuple $n_1,...,n_k$ of non-negative integers, the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}})^{n_1,...,n_k}\hookrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes\mathrm{Sym}^{n_1}(\mathcal{E}_1^*)\otimes...\otimes\mathrm{Sym}^{n_k}(\mathcal{E}_k^*)\to(\mathcal{L}_1^{-1})^{\otimes n_1}\otimes...\otimes(\mathcal{L}^{-1})_k^{\otimes n_k}$$

vanishes.

For $\mathcal{Y}$ integral, this condition is equivalent to demanding that the generic point of $\mathcal{Y}$ gets mapped to $\mathcal{T}$, just as in the definition of $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$.

Alternatively, let $C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)\subset\mathcal{E}_1\times...\times\mathcal{E}_k$ be the affine cone over $\mathcal{T}$. We have an action of $\mathbb{G}_m^k$ on $C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)$, and the stack-quotient $C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)/\mathbb{G}_m^k$ again contains $\mathcal{T}$ as an open subset. By definition, $\mathrm{Hom}(S,\mathrm{QMaps}^{\overline{a}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k))$ is the set of maps from $\mathcal{Y}\times S$ to the stack $C(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)/\mathbb{G}_m^k$, such that for every geometric $s\in S$, the map $\mathcal{Y}\times s\to C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)/\mathbb{G}_m^k$ sends the generic point of $\mathcal{Y}$ to $\mathcal{T}$.

The above definition has an obvious QQMaps version, and Lemma 1.9, Proposition 1.10 with its based analogues, generalize in a straightforward way. Note, however, that for the next proposition it is essential that we work with QMaps, and not with QQMaps, as we will be taking tensor products of $\mathcal{L}_i$'s.

Observe that $\mathcal{T}$ can be naturally embedded into $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)$ via the Segre embedding $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)\times...\times\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_k)\hookrightarrow\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)$.

Lemma 1.14. *There exists a map*

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^{\overline{a}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k))\to\mathrm{QMaps}^{a_1+...+a_k}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k),$$

extending the identity map on $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y},S)$. *Moreover, when* $\mathcal{Y}$ *is smooth, this map is finite.*

Proof. We have a map of stacks

$$C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)/\mathbb{G}_m\to C(\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)/\mathbb{G}_m^k,$$

which makes the existence of the map $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k))\to\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)$ obvious.

We know that when $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth, $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)$ is proper; therefore to check that our map is finite, it is enough to show that the fiber over every geometric point of the scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)$ is finite.

Suppose that we have a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{Y}$ with an injective map $\kappa:\mathcal{L}\to\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}\otimes(\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)$, such that there exists an open subset $U\subset\mathcal{Y}$ such that $\kappa|_U$ is a bundle map corresponding to a map $U\to\mathcal{T}$. In particular, we have the line bundles $\mathcal{L}_1^U,...,\mathcal{L}_k^U$, defined on U, such that $\mathcal{L}_1^U\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{L}_k^U\simeq\mathcal{L}|_U$.

Let $\mathcal{L}_i'$ be the (unique) extension of $\mathcal{L}_i^U$ such that the map $\mathcal{L}_i'\to\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}\otimes\mathcal{E}_i$ is regular and is a bundle map away from codimension 2. Clearly, $\mathcal{L}$ is a subsheaf in $\mathcal{L}_1'\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{L}_k'$.

Then the fiber of $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k))\to\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k)$ is the scheme classifying subsheaves $\mathcal{L}_i\subset\mathcal{L}_i'$ such that $\mathcal{L}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{L}_k\simeq\mathcal{L}$ and the maps $\mathcal{L}_i\to\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}\otimes\mathcal{E}_i$ continue to be regular. This scheme is clearly finite.

□

An example of the situation of Sect. 1.13 is this:

Suppose that $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}_1\times...\times\mathcal{T}_k$, and each $\mathcal{T}_i$ embeds into the corresponding $\mathcal{E}_i$. Then from Lemma 1.14 we obtain that there exists a finite morphism

$$\coprod_i \mathrm{QMaps}^{a_i}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}_i;\mathcal{E}_i)\simeq\mathrm{QMaps}^{\overline{a}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)\to\mathrm{QMaps}^{a_1+...+a_k}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_1\otimes...\otimes\mathcal{E}_k).$$

In the main body of the paper we will need the following technical statement. Let $\mathcal{T}_0\subset\mathcal{E}_0$ and $\mathcal{T}_0'\subset\mathcal{E}_0'$ be two projective varieties.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be another projective variety, embedded into $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_0)\times\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)\times...\times\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n)$, and endowed with a map $\mathcal{T}\to\mathcal{T}_0$, such that the two maps from $\mathcal{T}$ to $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_0)$ coincide.

Lemma 1.15. *The (a priori finite) map*

$$\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}_0,\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)\times\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}_0';\mathcal{E}_0')\to$$
$$\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}\times\mathcal{T}_0';\mathcal{E}_0\otimes\mathcal{E}_0',\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_k)\underset{\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}_0\times\mathcal{T}_0';\mathcal{E}_0\otimes\mathcal{E}_0')}{\times}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T}_0\times\mathcal{T}_0';\mathcal{E}_0,\mathcal{E}_0').$$

is an isomorphism.

The proof is straightforward.

1.16. Let $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ denote the open subset of $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ corresponding to the condition that $\mathrm{coker}(\kappa)$ is a torsion-free coherent sheaf on $\mathcal{Y}$ (over every geometric point s in the corresponding test scheme S). Let us denote by $\partial(\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}))$ the complement to $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ in $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$.

For a Hilbert polynomial p, let $\mathrm{TFree}_1^p(\mathcal{Y})$ denote the corresponding connected component of the stack of torsion-free coherent sheaves of generic rank 1 on $\mathcal{Y}$. For two parameters p,p', let us denote by $\mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')}$ the stack classifying triples $(\mathcal{L},\mathcal{L}',\beta:\mathcal{L}\hookrightarrow\mathcal{L}')$, where $\mathcal{L},\mathcal{L}'$ are points of $\mathrm{TFree}_1^p(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})$, respectively, and β is a non-zero map, which is automatically an embedding. Note that for $p=p'$, $\mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')}$ projects isomorphically onto $\mathrm{TFree}_1^p(\mathcal{Y})$.

Proposition 1.17. *There is a natural proper morphism*

$$\overline{\iota}_{p',p}:\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})\underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times}\mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')}\to\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}).$$

The composition

$$\iota_{p',p} : \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}{}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')} \to \mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$$

is a locally-closed embedding. Moreover, every geometric point of $\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ *belongs to the image of* $\iota_{p',p}$ *for exactly one* p'*.*

Proof. The map $\overline{\iota}_{p',p}$ is constructed in a most straightforward way: given an S-point of $\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T},\mathcal{E})$, i.e. a sheaf $\mathcal{L}'$ on $\mathcal{Y}\times S$, with an embedding $\kappa' : \mathcal{L}' \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes\mathcal{E}$, and S-point of $\mathcal{Y}^{Q,(p,p')}$, i.e. another sheaf $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{Y}\times S$ with an embedding $\beta : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}'$, we define a new point of $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T},\mathcal{E})$, by setting κ to be the composition $\kappa'\circ\beta$.

This map is proper, because the scheme $\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T},\mathcal{E})$ is proper, and so is the projection $\mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')} \to \mathrm{TFree}_1^{p}(\mathcal{Y})$.

Observe now that the map

$$\bigcup_{p'} \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}{}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')} \to \mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$$

is injective on the level of S-points for any S.

Indeed, for $(\mathcal{L},\mathcal{L}',\kappa',\beta)$ as above with $(\mathcal{L}',\kappa') \in \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}{}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$, the sheaf $\mathcal{L}'$ is reconstructed as the unique subsheaf in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes\mathcal{E}$ containing $\mathcal{L}$, such that the quotient $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{L}'$ is torsion-free over every geometric point of S. (Moreover, for every geometric point $(\mathcal{L},\kappa)$ of $\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$, such $\mathcal{L}'$ exists and equals the preimage in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}\otimes\mathcal{E}$ of the maximal torsion subsheaf in $\mathrm{coker}(\kappa)$.)

Thus, we obtain that the open subset in $\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')}$ equal to

$$(\overline{\iota}_{p',p})^{-1}(\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) - \overline{\iota}_{p',p}(\partial(\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}))))$$

coincides with $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}{}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')}$. Hence, the map

$$\overline{\iota}_{p',p} : \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}{}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')} \to \Big(\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) - \overline{\iota}_{p',p}(\partial(\mathrm{QQMaps}^{p'}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})))\Big)$$

is also proper, and being an injection on the level of S-points, it is a closed embedding.

□

Set now $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) := \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QQMaps}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \cap \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$, and $\partial(\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})) := \partial(\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})) \cap \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$.

For example, when $\mathcal{Y}$ is a smooth curve (in which case there is no difference between QMaps and QQMaps), the locus $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ coincides with $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$. Indeed, the condition that the quotient is torsion-free is equivalent in this case to its being a vector bundle.

Recall that by $\mathrm{Pic}^a(\mathcal{Y})$ we denote connected components of the Picard stack of $\mathcal{Y}$. Observe that if the parameters a, a' are such that $\mathrm{Pic}^{-a}(\mathcal{Y}) \times \mathrm{Pic}^{-a'}(\mathcal{Y}) \subset \mathrm{TFree}_1^p(\mathcal{Y}) \times \mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})$, then

$$\mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')} \underset{\mathrm{TFree}_1^p(\mathcal{Y}) \times \mathrm{TFree}_1^{p'}(\mathcal{Y})}{\times} \Big(\mathrm{Pic}^{-a}(\mathcal{Y}) \times \mathrm{Pic}^{-a'}(\mathcal{Y})\Big) \simeq \mathrm{Pic}^{-a'}(\mathcal{Y}) \times \mathcal{Y}^{(a-a')},$$

where by $\mathcal{Y}^{(b)}$ we denote the scheme that classifies pairs $(\mathcal{L}, s)$, where $\mathcal{L} \in \mathrm{Pic}^b(\mathcal{Y})$, and $s : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \to \mathcal{L}$ is a non-zero section. Note that when $\mathcal{Y}$ is a smooth curve, $\mathcal{Y}^{(b)}$ is just the corresponding symmetric power.

Thus, from the previous proposition, we have a map

$$\overline{\iota}_{a',a} : \mathrm{QMaps}^{a'}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}) \times \mathcal{Y}^{(a-a')} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{a}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}), \tag{2}$$

and a locally closed embedding $\iota_{a',a} : \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{QMaps}}{}^{a'}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}) \times \mathcal{Y}^{(a-a')} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{a}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$.

Assume now that $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth. We have:

Lemma 1.18. *The map $\overline{\iota}_{a',a} : \mathrm{QMaps}^{a'}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E}) \times \mathcal{Y}^{(a-a')} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{a}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ above is proper and finite. Every geometric point of $\mathrm{QMaps}^{a}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ belongs to the image of exactly one $\iota_{a',a}$.*

Proof. The properness assertion follows from the fact that the schemes $\mathrm{QMaps}^{a'}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ and $\mathcal{Y}^{(a-a')}$ are proper when $\mathcal{Y}$ is smooth. The finiteness follows from the fact that given two line bundles $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{L}'$ on $\mathcal{Y}$, the scheme classifying line bundles $\mathcal{L}''$, squeezed between the two, is finite.

To prove the last assertion, it suffices to observe that if $\mathcal{L}$ is a torsion free sheaf of generic rank 1 on a smooth variety, embedded into $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}} \otimes \mathcal{E}$, such that the quotient is torsion free, then $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle.

□

The above assertions have an obvious based analog. The only required modification is that instead of $\mathcal{Y}^{Q;(p,p')}$ (resp., $\mathcal{Y}^{(a-a')}$) we need to consider its open substack corresponding to the condition that $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}'$ is an isomorphism in a neighborhood of our subscheme $\mathcal{Y}'$ (resp., the section s has no zeroes on $\mathcal{Y}'$).

1.19. **Meromorphic quasi-maps.** In the sequel, we will have to consider the following generalization of the notion of quasi-map. We will formulate it in the relative situation.

Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a flat projective scheme over a base $\mathcal{X}$, and let $\mathcal{Y}_1 \subset \mathcal{Y}$ be a relative Cartier divisor. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a vector bundle defined over $\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}_1$, and $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ a closed subscheme.

We define the functor ${}_{\infty \cdot \mathcal{Y}_1}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ on the category of schemes over $\mathcal{X}$, to assign to a test scheme S the set of pairs $(\mathcal{L}, \kappa)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle over $\mathcal{Y} \underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times} S$, and κ is a map of coherent sheaves on $(\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}_1) \underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times} S$

$$\kappa : \mathcal{L}|_{(\mathcal{Y}-\mathcal{Y}_1)\underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times} S} \to \mathcal{E} \underset{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}}{\otimes} \mathcal{O}_S,$$

such that for an open dense subset $U \subset (\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}_1) \underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times} S$, over which κ is a bundle map, the resulting map $U \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ factors through $\mathcal{T}$.

Proposition 1.20. *The functor ${}_{\infty \cdot \mathcal{Y}_1}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T}; \mathcal{E})$ is representable by a strict ind-scheme of ind-finite type over $\mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{Y}_2$ is another relative Cartier divisor containing $\mathcal{Y}_1$. We have a closed embedding of functors ${}_{\infty\cdot\mathcal{Y}_1}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \hookrightarrow {}_{\infty\cdot\mathcal{Y}_2}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$.

Therefore, the question of ind-representability being local on $\mathcal{X}$, by enlarging $\mathcal{Y}_1$, we can assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is actually trivial; we will denote by the same character its extension on the entire $\mathcal{Y}$.

Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ be a line bundle on $\mathcal{Y}$ and $s : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a section such that $\mathcal{Y}_1$ is its set of zeroes. If $\mathcal{L}_1 \in \mathrm{Pic}^{a_1}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$, we have a natural closed embedding

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{a+a_1}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}),$$

as in (2), which sends a point $(\mathcal{L},\kappa) \in \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ to $(\mathcal{L}\otimes\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}, \mathcal{L}\otimes\mathcal{L}_1^{-1} \xrightarrow{s^{-1}} \mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathcal{E})$.

It is now easy to see that ${}_{\infty\cdot\mathcal{Y}_1}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ is representable by the inductive limit $\underset{\longrightarrow}{lim}\ \mathrm{QMaps}^{a+n\cdot a_1}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$.

□

If $\mathcal{Y}' \subset \mathcal{Y}$ is another closed subscheme, disjoint from $\mathcal{Y}_1$, endowed with a section $\sigma' : \mathcal{Y}' \to \mathcal{T}$, in the same manner we define the corresponding based version ${}_{\infty\cdot\mathcal{Y}_1}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})_{\mathcal{Y}',\sigma'}$, which is also a strict ind-scheme of ind-finite type.

1.21. Let now $\mathcal{E}$ be a pro-finite-dimensional vector space, i.e $\mathcal{E} = \underset{\longleftarrow}{lim}\,\mathcal{E}_i$. (In the relative situation, we will assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is an inverse limit of vector bundles on $\mathcal{Y}$.)

Let us recall the definition of the scheme $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ in this case. By definition, for a test scheme S, a map $S \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on S together with a map $S \to \mathcal{E}$ (which by definition means a compatible system of maps $S \to \mathcal{E}_i$), such that locally on S, starting from some index i, the map $S \to \mathcal{E}_i$ is an injective bundle map.

By construction, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is a union of open sub-schemes "$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) - \mathbb{P}(\ker(\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}_i))$", where each such open is the inverse limit of finite-dimensional schemes $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_j) - \mathbb{P}(\ker(\mathcal{E}_j \to \mathcal{E}_i))$, $j \geq i$.

When $\mathcal{Y}$ is a projective scheme, the scheme $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ makes sense, and it is also a union of schemes that are projective limits of schemes of finite type.

The definition of $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ proceeds in exactly the same way as when $\mathcal{E}$ is finite-dimensional. Namely, for a test scheme $\mathrm{Hom}(S, \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ is the set of pairs $\sigma = (\mathcal{L},\kappa)$, where $\mathcal{L}$ a coherent sheaf of generic rank 1 on $\mathcal{Y}\times S$, and κ is a compatible system of maps $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}\times S}\otimes\mathcal{E}_i$, such that for every geometric point $s \in S$ starting from some index i the map $\mathcal{L}_s \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}\otimes\mathcal{E}_i$ is injective.

It is easy to show that $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ is a union of open subschemes, each of which is a projective limit of schemes of finite type. However, $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$ itself is generally not of finite type.

If now $\mathcal{T}$ is a closed subscheme on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, we define $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ as the corresponding closed subscheme of $\mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$. As before, the open subscheme $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E}) \subset \mathrm{QQMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{E})$ is defined by the condition that $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle.

The following easily follows from Lemma 1.9 and Sect. 1.11. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a projective scheme of finite type embedded into $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is a pro-finite-dimensional vector space. Set $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{O}(1)_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Lemma 1.22. *We have a natural closed embedding* $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{T};\mathcal{P}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}))$.

2. Quasi-maps into flag schemes and Zastava spaces

In this section $\mathfrak{g}$ will be an arbitrary Kac-Moody algebra. Below we list some facts related to the flag scheme (and certain partial flag schemes) attached to $\mathfrak{g}$. These facts are established in [Ka] when $\mathfrak{g}$ is symmetrizable, but according to [Ka1], they hold in general. In the main

body of the paper we will only need the cases when $\mathfrak{g}$ is either finite-dimensional, or non-twisted affine.

2.1. We will work in the following set-up:

Let $A = (A_{ij})_{i,j\in I}$ be a finite Cartan matrix. We fix a root datum, that is, two finitely generated free abelian groups $\Lambda, \check{\Lambda}$ with a perfect bilinear pairing $\langle , \rangle : \Lambda \times \check{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{Z}$, and embeddings $I \subset \check{\Lambda},\ i \mapsto \check{\alpha}_i$ (simple roots), $I \subset \Lambda,\ i \mapsto \alpha_i$ (simple coroots) such that $\langle \alpha_i, \check{\alpha}_j \rangle = A_{ij}$.

We also assume that the subsets $I \subset \Lambda,\ I \subset \check{\Lambda}$ are both linearly independent, and that the subgroup of Λ generated by α_i is saturated (i.e., the quotient is torsion-free). In the finite type case, the last condition is equivalent to the fact that our root datum is simply-connected.

We denote by $\mathfrak{g}(A) = \mathfrak{g}$ (for short) the completed Kac-Moody Lie algebra associated to the above datum (see [Ka] 3.2). In particular, the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ identifies with $\Lambda \underset{\mathbb{Z}}{\otimes} \mathbb{C}$. Sometimes we will denote the corresponding root datum by $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}, \check{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ to stress the relation with $\mathfrak{g}$.

The semigroup of dominant coweights (resp. weights) will be denoted by $\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$ (resp. $\check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \check{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$). We say that $\lambda \leq \mu$ if $\mu - \lambda$ is an integral nonnegative linear combination of simple coroots $\alpha_i,\ i \in I$. The semi-group of coweights λ, which are ≥ 0 in this sense will be denoted $\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

To a dominant weight $\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g}}$ one attaches the integrable $\mathfrak{g}$-module, denoted $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}}$, with a fixed highest weight vector $v_{\check{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}}$. For a pair of weights $\check{\lambda}_1, \check{\lambda}_2 \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g}}$, there is a canonical map $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ that sends $v_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2}$ to $v_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes v_{\check{\lambda}_2}$.

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ has a triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n} \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^-$ (here $\mathfrak{n}$ is a profinite dimensional vector space), and we have standard Borel subalgebras $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{n} \oplus \mathfrak{h},\ \mathfrak{b}^- = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^-$.

If $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a standard parabolic, we will denote by $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{p}) \subset \mathfrak{n}$ its unipotent radical, by $\mathfrak{p}^- \subset \mathfrak{g}$ (resp., $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{p}^-) \subset \mathfrak{n}^-$) the corresponding opposite parabolic (resp., its unipotent radical), and by $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{p}) := \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{p}^-$ (or just $\mathfrak{m}$) the Levi factor. We will write $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{m})$ (resp., $\mathfrak{n}^-(\mathfrak{m})$) for the intersections $\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n}$ and $\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n}^-$, respectively.

If i is an element of I, we will denote the corresponding submininal parabolic by $\mathfrak{p}_i$, and by $\mathfrak{p}_i^-$, $\mathfrak{n}_i := \mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{p}_i)$, $\mathfrak{n}_i^- := \mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{p}_i^-)$, $\mathfrak{m}_i$, respectively, the corresponding associated subalgebras. For a standard Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{m}$, we will write that $i \in \mathfrak{m}$ if the corresponding simple root $\check{\alpha}_i$ belongs to $\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{m})$.

From now on we will only work with parabolics corresponding to subdiagrams of I of *finite type*. In particular, the Levi $\mathfrak{m}$ is finite-dimensional, and there exists a canonically defined reductive group M, such that $\mathfrak{m}$ is its Lie algebra. (When $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$, the corresponding Levi is the Cartan torus T, whose set of cocharacters is our lattice $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$.) By the assumption on the root datum, the derived group of M is simply-connected.

We will denote by $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ the quotient of $\Lambda = \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$ by the subgroup generated by $\mathrm{Span}(\alpha_i,\ i \in \mathfrak{m})$. In other words, $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is the group of cocharacters of $M/[M,M]$. By $\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ we will denote the sub-semigroup of $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ equal to the positive span of the images of $\alpha_i \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}} \twoheadrightarrow \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ for $i \notin \mathfrak{m}$.

In addition, there exists a pro-algebraic group P, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}$, with projects onto M, and the kernel $N(P)$ is pro-unipotent.

The entire group G associated to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, along with its subgroup P^-, exists as a group-indscheme. Of course, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional, G is the corresponding reductive group. In the untwisted affine case, i.e., for $\mathfrak{g}_{aff} = \mathfrak{g}((x)) \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C} \oplus d \cdot \mathbb{C}$ being the affinization of a finite-dimensional simple $\mathfrak{g}$ (cf. Sect. 3.7), the corresponding group-indscheme is $G_{aff} := \widehat{G} \times \mathbb{G}_m$,

where $\widehat{G}$ is the canonical central extension $1 \to \mathbb{G}_m \to \widehat{G} \to G((x)) \to 1$ of the loop group-indscheme $G((x))$, corresponding to the minimal $ad_{\mathfrak{g}}$-invariant scalar product on $\mathfrak{g}$, such that the induced bilinear form on $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is integral-valued.

2.2. **Kashiwara's flag schemes.** Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a standard parabolic, corresponding to a subdiagram of I of finite type. Following Kashiwara (cf. [Ka]), one defines the (partial) flag schemes $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, equipped with the action of G. Each $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ has a unit point $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$, and its stabilizer in G equals P^-, so that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ should be thought of as the quotient "G/P^-".

The scheme $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ comes equipped with a closed embedding (called the *Plücker embedding*)

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \hookrightarrow \prod \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}}),$$

where the product is being taken over $\check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} := \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g}} \cap \check{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \subset \check{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and where each $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}}$ is the profinite dimensional vector space dual to the integrable module $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}}$. The subscheme $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \hookrightarrow \prod \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})$ is cut out by the so-called *Plücker equations*:

A collection of lines $(\ell_{\check{\lambda}} \subset \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})_{\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$ satisfies Plücker equations if

(a) For the canonical morphism $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_2}$, the map $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_1} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2}$ sends $\ell_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \ell_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ to $\ell_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2}$;

(b) For any $\mathfrak{g}$-morphism $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\mu}} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ with $\check{\mu} \neq \check{\lambda}_1 + \check{\lambda}_2$, the map $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_1} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\mu}}$ sends $\ell_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \ell_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ to 0.

The point $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$ corresponds to the system of lines $(\ell^0_{\check{\lambda}} \subset \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})$ where $\ell^0_{\check{\lambda}} = (\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})^{\mathfrak{n}^-}$.

The inverse image of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})$ is the line bundle on $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ denoted by $\mathcal{P}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. We have $\Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathcal{V}_{\lambda}$.

The orbits of the action of the pro-algebraic group $N(P)$ on $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ are parametrized by the double quotient $\mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}} \backslash \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{g}} / \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, where $\mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ are the Weyl groups of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{m}$, respectively. For $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}} \backslash \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{g}} / \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, we will denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},w}$ the corresponding orbit (in our normalization, the unit point $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},e}$, where $e \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the unit element). By $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},w}$ we will denote the closure of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},w}$ (e.g., $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},e}$ equals the entire $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$), and by $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ the open subscheme equal to union of orbits with parameters $w' \leq w$ in the sense of the usual Bruhat order. For each $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}} \backslash \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{g}} / \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ there exists a canonical subgroup $N(P)_w \subset N(P)$, of finite codimension, such that $N(P)_w$ acts freely on $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ with a finite-dimensional quotient.

For every simple reflection $s_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ with $\alpha_i \notin \mathfrak{m}$, we have a codimension 1 subscheme $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i}$, and its closure $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i}$ is an effective Cartier divisor. The union $\bigcup_i \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i}$ is called *the Schubert divisor* and it equals the complement $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} - \mathcal{G}^e_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

Consider the affine cone $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ over $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ corresponding to the Plücker embedding. This is a closed subscheme of $\prod_{\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}} \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}}$ consisting of collections of vectors $(u_{\check{\lambda}} \subset \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})_{\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$ satisfying the Plücker equations:

(a) For the canonical morphism $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_2}$, the map $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_1} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2}$ sends $u_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes u_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ to $u_{\check{\lambda}_1+\check{\lambda}_2}$;

(b) For any $\mathfrak{g}$-morphism $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\mu}} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ with $\check{\mu} \neq \check{\lambda}_1 + \check{\lambda}_2$, the map $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_1} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}_2} \to \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\mu}}$ sends $u_{\check{\lambda}_1} \otimes u_{\check{\lambda}_2}$ to 0.

We have a natural action of the torus $M/[M,M]$ on $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$. Let $\overset{\circ}{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ be the open subset corresponding to the condition that all $u_{\check\lambda} \neq 0$. Then $\overset{\circ}{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is a principal $M/[M,M]$-bundle over $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

2.3. **Quasi-maps into flag schemes.** Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a smooth projective curve, with a marked point $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{C}$, called "infinity". We will denote by $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$ the complement $\mathbf{C} - \infty_{\mathbf{C}}$.

We will use a short-hand notation $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ for the scheme of *based quasi-maps* $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}; \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda}, \check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})_{\infty_{\mathbf{C}}, \sigma_{const}}$, where $\sigma_{const} : \infty_{\mathbf{C}} \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is the constant map corresponding to $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. In other words, $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ classifies based maps from $\mathbf{C}$ to the stack $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/(M/[M,M])$. By $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ we will denote the open subscheme of maps.

The scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ splits as a disjoint union according the degree, which in our case is given by elements $\theta \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

For a fixed parameter θ as above, let $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}$ be the corresponding partially symmetrized power of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$. I.e., a point of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}$ assigns to every $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ an element of the usual symmetric power $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(n)}$, where $n = \langle \theta, \check\lambda \rangle$, and this assignment must be linear in $\check\lambda$ in a natural sense. Explicitly, if $\theta = \sum\limits_{i \in I} n_i \cdot \alpha_i$, for $i \notin \mathfrak{m}$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta} \simeq \prod\limits_{i \in I} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(n_i)}$.

From Sect. 1.16, we obtain that for each $\theta', \theta - \theta' \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, we have a finite map

$$\overline{\iota}_{\theta'} : \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta-\theta'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta'} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}), \tag{3}$$

such that the corresponding map

$$\iota_{\theta'} : \mathrm{Maps}^{\theta-\theta'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta'} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$$

is a locally closed embedding. Moreover, the images of $\iota_{\theta'}$ define a decomposition of $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ into locally-closed pieces. We will denote the embedding of the deepest stratum $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ by $\mathfrak{s}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Given a quasi-map $\sigma \in \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, which is the image of

$$(\sigma' \in \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta-\theta'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}), \theta_k \cdot \mathbf{c}_k \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta'}),$$

we will say that (a) the defect of σ is concentrated in $\bigcup\limits_k \mathbf{c}_k$, (b) the defect of σ at $\mathbf{c}_k$ equals θ_k, (c) the total defect equals θ', and (d) σ' is the saturation of σ. Sometimes, we will assemble statements (a), (b) and (c) into one by saying that the defect of σ is the colored divisor $\sum\limits_k \theta_k \cdot \mathbf{c}_k \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta'}$.

2.4. **The finite-dimensional case.** Assume for a moment that $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional. Let $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ (resp., $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$) denote the stack of G-bundles on $\mathbf{C}$ (resp., G-bundles trivialized at $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$).

We can consider a relative situation over $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ (resp., over $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$), when one takes maps or quasi-maps (resp., based maps or quasi-maps) from $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathcal{F}_G \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, where $\mathcal{F}_G$ is a point of $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ (resp., $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$).

The corresponding stacks of maps identify, respectively, with the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_{P^-}(\mathbf{C})$ of P^--bundles on $\mathbf{C}$, and $\mathrm{Bun}_{P^-}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$–the stack P^--bundles on $\mathbf{C}$ trivialized at $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$.

In the non-based case, the stack of relative quasi-maps is denoted by $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_{P^-}(\mathbf{C})$, and it was studied in [BG1] and [BFGM]. The corresponding stack of relative based quasi-maps will be denoted by $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_{P^-}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$.

2.5. **Some properties of quasi-maps' spaces.** Let $\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be a coweight, such that $\langle \nu, \check{\alpha}_i \rangle = 0$ for $i \in \mathfrak{m}$, and $\langle \nu, \check{\alpha}_i \rangle > 0$ if $i \notin \mathfrak{m}$. Consider the corresponding 1-parameter subgroup $\mathbb{G}_m \to T$. Since the point $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$ is T-stable, we obtain a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$.

In what follows, if a group $\mathbb{G}_m$ acts on a scheme $\mathcal{Y}$, we will say that the action contracts $\mathcal{Y}$ to a subscheme $\mathcal{Y}' \subset \mathcal{Y}$, if: (a) the action on $\mathcal{Y}'$ is trivial, and (b) the action map extends to a morphism $\mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}$, such that $0 \times \mathcal{Y}$ is mapped to $\mathcal{Y}'$.

Proposition 2.6. *The above $\mathbb{G}_m$-action contracts $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ to $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta} \overset{\mathfrak{s}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}}}{\subset} \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$.*

Proof. The above T-action on $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ corresponds to an action of T on the cone $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{g}})$ that takes a collection of vectors $(u_{\check{\lambda}} \in \mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})_{\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}$ to $\check{\lambda}(t) \cdot t \cdot u_{\check{\lambda}}$, where $t \cdot u$ denotes the T-action on the representation $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}}$.

It is clear now that a 1-parameter subgroup corresponding to ν as in the proposition contracts each $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}}$ to the line $\ell^0_{\check{\lambda}}$.

However, the subscheme of quasi-maps, which map $\mathbf{C}$ to $(\ell^0_{\check{\lambda}})_{\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}} \subset C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{g}})$ coincides with $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta})$.

□

Proposition 2.7. *The scheme $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is a union of open subschemes of finite type.*

Remark. One can prove that the scheme $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ is in fact globally of finite type, at least when $\mathfrak{g}$ is symmetrizable, cf. Sect. 18, but the proof is more involved. Of course, when $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional, this is obvious. When $\mathfrak{g}$ is (untwisted) affine, another proof will be given in the next section, using a modular interpretation of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ via bundles on the projective line.

Proof. Let us first remark that if $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are projective schemes, and $\mathcal{T}^0 \subset \mathcal{T}$ is an open subscheme, the subfunctor of $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{T})$ consisting of maps landing in $\mathcal{T}^0$ is in fact an open subscheme.

For an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}} \backslash \mathcal{W} / \mathcal{W}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, let $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ be the open subset in $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ of maps that land in the open subset $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. Evidently, $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \simeq \underset{w}{\cup} \mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$. We claim that each $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is of finite type.

Recall that the subgroup $N(P)_w \subset N(P)$ acts freely on $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ and that the quotient $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}/N(P)_w$ is a quasi-projective scheme of finite type. Hence, the scheme (of based maps) $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}/N(P)_w)$ is of finite type.

We claim now that the natural projection map

$$\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/N(P)_w$$

is a closed embedding. (We will show moreover that this map is actually an isomorphism if $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0.)

First, let us show that this map is injective on the level of S-points for any S. Let σ_1, σ_2 be two based maps $\mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ which project to the same map to $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}/N(P)_w$. Then by definition, we obtain a map $\widetilde{\sigma} : \mathbf{C} \times S \to N(P)_w$ with $\widetilde{\sigma}|_{\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times S} \equiv 1$. Since $\mathbf{C}$ is projective and $N(P)_w$ is an inverse limit of groups which are extensions of $\mathbb{G}_a$, we obtain that $\widetilde{\sigma} \equiv 1$.

Now let us show that the map $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/N(P)_w$ is proper by checking the valuative criterion.

Let σ' be a based map $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X} \to \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}/N(P)_w$, where $\mathbf{X}$ is an affine curve such that the restriction $\sigma'|_{\mathbf{C}\times(\mathbf{X}-0_{\mathbf{X}})}$ lifts to a map to $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. Let us filter $N(P)_w$ by normal subgroups $N(P)_w = N_0 \supset N_1 \supset \ldots$ with associated graded quotients isomorphic to the additive group $\mathbb{G}_a$. Set $\sigma'_0 = \sigma'$, and assume that we have found a lifting of σ' to a based map $\sigma'_i : \mathbf{C}\times\mathbf{X} \to \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}/N_i$. Then the obstruction to lifting it to the next level lies in $H^1(\mathbf{C}\times\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{O}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \boxtimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{X}})$. Since $\mathbf{X}$ is affine, the last group is isomorphic to the space of $H^1(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{O}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}}))$-valued functions on $\mathbf{X}$. By assumption, the function corresponding to the obstruction class vanishes on the open subset $\mathbf{X} - 0_{\mathbf{X}}$, therefore it vanishes.

Note that when $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0, and an arbitrary affine base S, the same argument shows that any based map $\sigma' : \mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}/N(P)_w$ lifts to a map $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X} \to \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, because in this case $H^1(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{O}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}})) = 0$.

□

Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{p}'$ be a pair of standard parabolics, and set $\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}') = \mathfrak{m}' \cap \mathfrak{p}$ to be the corresponding parabolic in $\mathfrak{m}'$. Note that we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}')} \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'} \to 0.$$

Lemma 2.8. *We have a natural map* $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'})$*, where* θ' *is the image of* θ *under the above map of lattices. If* $\theta' = 0$*, there is an isomorphism* $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \simeq \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}')})$.

Proof. The existence of the map $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'})$ is immediate from the definitions.

Note that if $\theta' = 0$, $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'})$ is a point-scheme that corresponds to the constant map $\mathbf{C} \to 1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'}$. Note also that the preimage of $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'}}$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ identifies naturally with $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{m}'(\mathfrak{p})}$. In particular, for θ as above, we have a closed embedding $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}')}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$.

To see that it is an isomorphism, note that for any $\sigma \in \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ there exists an open dense subset $U \subset \mathbf{C} \times S$, such that the map $\sigma|_U$ projects to the constant map $U \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'}$, and hence, has its image in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}')}$. But this implies that σ itself is a quasi-map into $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}')}$.

□

Assume for example that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$ and that $\mu \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ equals α_i for some $i \notin \mathfrak{m}$. By putting $\mathfrak{p}' = \mathfrak{p}_i$, from the previous lemma we obtain that the space $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ in this case identifies with the space of based quasi-maps $\mathbf{C} \to \mathbb{P}^1$ of degree 1. In particular, it is empty unless $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0, and for $\mathbf{C} \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$, it is isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^2$.

Note that we have a natural map $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$. Indeed, for a based map $\mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ we define an M-bundle on $\mathbf{C} \times S$ by taking the Cartesian product

$$(\mathbf{C} \times S) \underset{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}}{\times} \overset{\circ}{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}},$$

where $\overset{\circ}{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is as in Sect. 2.29.

The corresponding schemes $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ and $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'})$ are related in the following explicit way:

Let $P^-(M')$ be the parabolic in M' corresponding to $\mathfrak{p}^-(\mathfrak{m}')$. Let $\mathrm{Bun}_{M'}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})$, be the stack as in Sect. 2.4, and let $\mathrm{Bun}_{P^-(M')}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \subset \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_{P^-(M')}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})$ be the corresponding stacks of $P^-(M')$-bundles and generalized $P^-(M')$-bundles, respectively.

The following is straightforward from the definitions:

Lemma 2.9. *There exists an open embedding*

$$\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_{M'}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_{P^-(M')}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}),$$

whose image is the union of $\mathrm{Im}(\iota_{\theta'})$ *over* $\theta' \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{m}',\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{m}')}$. *Moreover, the map*

$$\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}'}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_{M'}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathrm{Bun}_{P^-(M')}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$$

is an isomorphism.

For $\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{b}$ and a vertex $i\in I$, let us denote by $\partial(\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}))_i$ the locally closed subset equal to $\mathrm{Im}(\iota_{\alpha_i})$.

The above lemma combined with Proposition 2.7 yield the following:

Corollary 2.10. *The open subscheme* $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}) \bigcup \left(\underset{i\in I}{\cup} \partial(\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}))_i \right)$ *is (locally) of finite type.*

2.11. **Projection to the configuration space.** We claim that there exists a canonical map $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}} : \mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta$. Indeed, let σ be an S-point of $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, i.e., for every $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ we have a line bundle $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}$ on $\mathbf{C}\times S$ and a map $\kappa^{\check\lambda}: \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}\otimes \mathcal{V}^*_{\check\lambda}$. Recall that the choice of the standard parabolic $\mathfrak{p}$ defines a highest weight vector in $\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda}$; hence by composing $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$ with the corresponding map $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}\otimes \mathcal{V}^*_{\check\lambda} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}$, we obtain a map $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda} \to \mathcal{O}$, i.e. a point of $\mathbf{C}^{(\langle\theta,\check\lambda\rangle)}$. The obtained divisor avoids $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$ because the composition $\ell^0_{\check\lambda} \to \mathcal{V}^*_{\check\lambda} \to \mathbb{C}$ is non-zero.

The above construction of $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ can be alternatively viewed as follows. Recall the cone $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, and observe that for each vertex $i\in I$ with $i\notin\mathfrak{m}$, we have a function on $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ corresponding to the map $\mathcal{V}_{\check\omega_i}\to\mathbb{C}$, where $\check\omega_i$ is the fundamental weight. Let us denote by $C(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i})$ the corresponding Cartier divisor. Note that the intersection $\overset{\circ}{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \cap C(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i})$ is the preimage of the Cartier divisor $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

An S-point of $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is a map $\sigma: \mathbf{C}\times S \to C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/(M/[M,M])$, and by pulling back $C(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i})$, we obtain a Cartier divisor on $\mathbf{C}\times S$, which by the conditions on σ is in fact a relative Cartier divisor over S, i.e. it gives rise to a map from S to the suitable symmetric power of $\mathbf{C}$.

Note that the composition of the map $\mathfrak{s}^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the identity map on $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta$. More generally, for $\theta'\in\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, the composition

$$\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}} \circ \iota_{\theta'} : \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta-\theta'}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta'} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta} \tag{4}$$

covers the addition map $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta-\theta'} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta'} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}$.

2.12. **Zastava spaces.** We will introduce twisted versions of the schemes $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, called *Zastava spaces* $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, cf. [BFGM]. We will first define $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ as a functor, and later show that it is representable by a scheme.

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a smooth curve (not necessarily complete). An S-point of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is a data of $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_{N(P)}, \kappa)$, where

- D^θ is an S-point of $\mathbf{C}^\theta$. In particular, we obtain a principal $M/[M,M]$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$ on $\mathbf{C}\times S$, such that for every $\check{\lambda}\in\check{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ the associated line bundle denoted $\mathcal{L}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}$ equals $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}(-\check{\lambda}(D^\theta))$.
- $\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}$ is a principal $N(P)$-bundle on $\mathbf{C}\times S$. Note that this makes sense, since $N(P)$ is a pro-algebraic group. In particular, for every $N(P)$-integrable $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathcal{V}$, we can form a pro-vector bundle $(\mathcal{V}^*)_{\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}}$ on $\mathbf{C}\times S$. If $v\in\mathcal{V}$ is an $N(P)$-invariant vector, it gives rise to a map $(\mathcal{V}^*)_{\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}}\to\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}$.
- κ is a system of maps $\kappa^{\check{\lambda}}:\mathcal{L}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}\to(\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}}$, which satisfy the Plücker relations, and such that the composition of $\kappa^{\check{\lambda}}$ and the projection $(\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}}\to\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}$ corresponding to the h.w. vector $v_{\check{\lambda}}\in\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}}$ is the tautological map $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}(-\check{\lambda}(D^\theta))\to\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S}$.

We will denote by $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ the open subfunctor in $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ corresponding to the condition that the $\kappa^{\check{\lambda}}$'s are injective bundle maps.

Another way to spell out the definition of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is as follows: Let us consider the quotient $N(P)\backslash C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/(M/[M,M])$. This is a non-algebraic stack (i.e. all the axioms, but the one about covering by a scheme, hold). It contains as an open substack $N(P)\backslash\mathcal{G}^e_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}\simeq pt$, and the Cartier divisors $N(P)\backslash C(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i})/(M/[M,M])$ for $i\in I$.

It is easy to see that an S-point of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is the same as a map

$$\mathbf{C}\times S\to N(P)\backslash C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/(M/[M,M]),$$

such that for every geometric point $s\in S$, the map $\mathbf{C}\simeq\mathbf{C}\times s\to N(P)\backslash C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/(M/[M,M])$ sends the generic point of $\mathbf{C}$ to $N(P)\backslash\mathcal{G}^e_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}\simeq pt$, and the intersection

$$\mathbf{C}\cap\big(N(P)\backslash C(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},s_i})/M/[M,M]\big)$$

is a divisor of degree $\langle\theta,\check{\omega}_i\rangle$ on $\mathbf{C}$.

From this description of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ we obtain the following:

Lemma 2.13. *For an S-point $(D^\theta,\mathcal{F}_{N(P)},\kappa)$ of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, the $N(P)$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}$ admits a canonical trivialization away from the support of D^θ. Moreover, in terms of this trivialization, over this open subset the maps $\kappa^{\check{\lambda}}$ are constant maps corresponding to $v_{\check{\lambda}}\in\ell^0_{\check{\lambda}}\subset\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\lambda}}$.*

For the proof it suffices to observe that for a map $\mathbf{C}\times S\to N(P)\backslash C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/(M/[M,M])$, the open subset $\mathbf{C}\times S-\mathrm{supp}(D^\theta)$ is exactly the preimage of $pt=N(P)\backslash\mathcal{G}^e_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

Let us consider now the following set-up, suggested in this generality by Drinfeld. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a (non-necessarily algebraic) stack, which contains an open substack $\mathcal{T}^0$ isomorphic to pt. Let S be a scheme, embedded as an open subscheme into a scheme S_1, and let $\sigma:S\to\mathcal{T}$ be a map such that $\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{T}-\mathcal{T}^0)$ is closed in S_1.

Lemma 2.14. *There is a canonical bijection between the set of maps σ as above and the set of maps $\sigma_1:S_1\to\mathcal{T}$ such that $\sigma_1^{-1}(\mathcal{T}-\mathcal{T}^0)$ is contained in S.*

Proof. Of course, starting from σ_1, we get the corresponding σ by restriction to S.

Conversely, for $\sigma:\mathcal{Y}\times S\to\mathcal{T}$ as above, consider the two open subsets S and $S_1-(\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{T}-\mathcal{T}^0))$, which cover S_1.

By setting $\sigma_1|_S=\sigma$, $\sigma_1|_{S_1-(\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{T}-\mathcal{T}^0))}$ to be the constant map to $pt=\mathcal{T}^0$, we have a gluing data for σ_1.

□

We apply this lemma in the following situation:

Corollary 2.15. *Let $\mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{C}_1$ be an open embedding of curves. We have an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}_1) \underset{\mathbf{C}_1^{\theta}}{\times} \mathbf{C}^{\theta}.$$

The proof follows from the fact that for S-point of $\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, the support of the colored divisor D^{θ}, which is the same as the preimage of $N(P)\backslash(C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}))/(M/[M,M]) - pt$, is finite over S.

2.16. **Factorization principle.** Let $pt = \mathcal{T}^0 \subset \mathcal{T}$ be an embedding of stacks as before, and suppose now that the complement $\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{T}^0$ is a union of Cartier divisors $\mathcal{T}_i$, for i belonging to some set of indices I.

For a set of non-negative integers $\overline{n} = n_i, i \in I$, consider the functor $\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T})$ that assigns to a scheme S the set of maps

$$\sigma : \mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{T},$$

such that each $\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{T}_i) \subset \mathbf{C} \times S$ is a relative (over S) Cartier divisor of degree n_i. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T})$ is a sheaf in the faithfully-flat topology on the category of schemes. [1]

By construction, we have a map (of functors) $\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T}) \to \prod\limits_{i \in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i)}$. The following factorization principle is due to Drinfeld:

Proposition 2.17. *Let $n_i = n_i' + n_i''$ be a decomposition, and let $(\prod\limits_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i')} \times \prod\limits_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i'')})_{disj}$ be the open subset corresponding to the condition that the divisors $D_i' \in \mathbf{C}^{(n_i')}$ and $D_i'' \in \mathbf{C}^{(n_i'')}$ have disjoint supports. We have a canonical isomorphism:*

$$\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T}) \underset{\prod\limits_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i)}}{\times} (\prod_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i')} \times \prod_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i'')})_{disj} \simeq$$

$$(\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T}) \times \mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}''}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T})) \underset{\prod\limits_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i')} \times \prod\limits_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i'')}}{\times} (\prod_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i')} \times \prod_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i'')})_{disj}.$$

Proof. Given an S-point (σ, D', D'') of

$$\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T}) \underset{\prod\limits_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i)}}{\times} (\prod_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i')} \times \prod_{i\in I} \mathbf{C}^{(n_i'')})_{disj}$$

we produce the S-points σ' and σ'' of $\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}'}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T})$ and $\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}''}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T})$ as follows:

As a map $\mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{T}$, σ' is set to be equal to σ on the open subset $\mathbf{C} \times S - \mathrm{supp}(D'')$, and to the constant map $\mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{T}^0 = pt$ on the open subset $\mathbf{C} \times S - \mathrm{supp}(D')$. By assumption, this gives a well-defined gluing data for σ'. The map σ'' is defined by interchanging the roles of $'$ and $''$.

Conversely, given σ' and σ'', with the corresponding colored divisors D' and D'', respectively, we define σ as follows. On the open subset $\mathbf{C} \times S - \mathrm{supp}(D'')$, σ is set to be equal to σ', and on the open subset $\mathbf{C} \times S - \mathrm{supp}(D')$, σ is set to be equal to σ''. Since σ' and σ'' agree on $\mathbf{C} \times S - \mathrm{supp}(D' + D'')$, this gives a well-defined gluing data for σ.

□

The above proposition admits the following generalization. Let $p : \widetilde{\mathbf{C}} \to \mathbf{C}$ be an étale cover. Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(n)}_{disj} \subset \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(n)}$ be the open subset that consists of divisors $\widetilde{D}$ on $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}$, such that the divisor $p^*(p_*(\widetilde{D})) - \widetilde{D}$ is disjoint from $\widetilde{D}$.

Essentially the same proof gives the following:

[1] According to Drinfeld, one can formulate a general hypothesis on $\mathcal{T}$, under which the functor $\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{T})$ is representable by a scheme.

Proposition 2.18. *There is a canonical isomorphism:*

$$\mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{T}) \underset{\prod_{i\in I}\mathbf{C}^{(n_i)}}{\times} \prod_{i\in I}\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(n_i)}_{disj} \simeq \mathrm{Maps}^{\overline{n}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}},\mathcal{T}) \underset{\prod_{i\in I}\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(n_i)}}{\times} \prod_{i\in I}\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(n_i)}_{disj}.$$

As an application, we take $\mathcal{T} = N(P)\backslash(C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}))/(M/[M,M])$, and we obtain the following factorization property of the Zastava spaces:

Proposition 2.19. *For an étale map $p:\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}\to\mathbf{C}$ we have a canonical isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathbf{C}^{\theta}}{\times} \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{\theta}_{disj} \simeq \mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}) \underset{\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{\theta}}{\times} \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{\theta}_{disj}.$$

In particular, for $\theta=\theta_1+\theta_2$, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathbf{C}^{\theta}}{\times} (\mathbf{C}^{\theta_1}\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta_2})_{disj} \simeq (\mathcal{Z}^{\theta_1}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathcal{Z}^{\theta_2}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})) \underset{\mathbf{C}^{\theta_1}\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta_2}}{\times} (\mathbf{C}^{\theta_1}\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta_2})_{disj}.$$

Moreover, the above isomorphisms preserve the loci $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\subset\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}})\subset\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}})$

This proposition together with Lemma 2.14 expresses the locality property of the Zastava spaces $\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ with respect to $\mathbf{C}$.

Another application of Proposition 2.17 is Proposition 6.6, where $\mathcal{T}$ is taken to be the stack of coherent sheaves of generic rank n on $\mathbb{P}^1$ with a trivialization at ∞.

2.20. **The case of genus 0.** Let now $\mathbf{C}$ be a projective line, and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}-\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$ the corresponding affine line.

The following proposition will play a key role in this paper.

Proposition 2.21. *The functor represented by $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is naturally isomorphic to $\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$.*

Proof. By the very definition of $\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$, the assertion of the proposition amounts to the following: For an S-point $(D^{\theta},\mathcal{F}_{N(P)},\kappa)$ of $\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$, the $N(P)$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}$ on $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}\times S$ can be canonically trivialized.

Note that according to Corollary 2.15, $\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}$ extends to a principal $N(P)$-bundle on the entire $\mathbf{C}\times S$, with a trivialization on $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}\times S$. But since $N(P)$ is pro-unipotent, and $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0, such a trivialization extends uniquely on $\mathbf{C}\times S$.

(Note, however, that this trivialization and the one coming from Lemma 2.13 DO NOT agree, but they do coincide on $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}\times S$.)

□

Remark. For a curve of an arbitrary genus, it is easy to see that the natural map $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})\to\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$ is a closed embedding.

Indeed, if $N(P)$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}$ trivialized at $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$ can be trivialized globally, this can be done in a unique fashion (since $H^0(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}}))=0$), and the property that it admits such a trivialization is a closed condition.

As a corollary of Proposition 2.21, we obtain the following statement:

Corollary 2.22. *The functor $\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is representable by a scheme for any curve $\mathbf{C}$. The corresponding open subscheme $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is locally of finite type.*

Proof. Using Corollary 2.15 and Proposition 2.19, we reduce the assertions of the proposition to the case when the curve in question is the projective line. The representability follows now from Proposition 2.21. The fact that $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is of finite type follows from Proposition 2.7. □

2.23. **Further properties of maps' spaces.** In this subsection (until Sect. 2.29) we will assume that $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0, and establish certain properties of the scheme $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$. Using Proposition 2.21, the same assertions will hold for the space $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ on any curve $\mathbf{C}$.

First, note that Proposition 2.21 and Proposition 2.19 yield the following factorization property of $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ with respect to the projection $\varrho^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}}$:

$$(5)\quad \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathbf{C}^{\theta}}{\times} (\mathbf{C}^{\theta_1} \times \mathbf{C}^{\theta_2})_{disj} \simeq (\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta_1}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \times \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta_2}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})) \underset{\mathbf{C}^{\theta_1}\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta_2}}{\times} (\mathbf{C}^{\theta_1} \times \mathbf{C}^{\theta_2})_{disj}.$$

Proposition 2.24. *The scheme* $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ *is smooth.*

Proof. Let $\sigma : \mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ be a based map, where S is an Artinian scheme, and let $S' \supset S$ be a bigger Artinian scheme. We must show that σ extends to a based map $\sigma' : \mathbf{C} \times S' \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

Since $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is a union of open subschemes, each of which is a projective limit of smooth schemes under smooth maps, locally on $\mathbf{C}$ there is no obstruction for extending σ. Therefore, by induction on the length of S', we obtain that the obstruction to the existence of σ' lies in $H^1(\mathbf{C}, \sigma^*(T\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}}))$, where $T\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is the tangent sheaf on $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

However, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ surjects onto the tangent space to $T\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ at every point. Therefore, we have a surjection $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathfrak{g} \twoheadrightarrow \sigma^*(T\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$. Hence, we have a surjection on the level of H^1, but $H^1(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathfrak{g}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}})) \simeq H^1(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}})) \otimes \mathfrak{g} = 0$. □

Let now $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$, and for an element $\mu \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ equal to $\mu = \sum_i n_i \cdot \alpha_i$ let us define the length of μ as $|\mu| = \sum n_i$.

Proposition 2.25. *The scheme* $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ *is connected.*

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on the length of μ. If $|\mu| = 1$, or more generally, if μ is the image of $n \cdot \alpha_i$ for some $i \in I$, the scheme $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ is isomorphic to the scheme of based maps $\mathbf{C} \to \mathbb{P}^1$ of degree n, and hence is connected.

Let μ be an element of minimal length for which $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ is disconnected. By what we said above, we can assume that μ is not a multiple of one simple coroot.

By the factorization property, Equation (5), and the minimality assumption, $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ contains a connected component $\mathbf{K}$, which projects under $\varrho^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ to the main diagonal $\Delta(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}) \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$. We claim that this leads to a contradiction.

Indeed, by the definition of $\varrho^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{b}}$, for any map $\sigma \in \mathbf{K}$ there exists a unique point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$ with $\sigma(\mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} - \mathcal{G}^{e}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$. Let $w \in \mathcal{W}$ be minimal with the property that there exists $\sigma \in \mathbf{K}$ as above, such that $\sigma(\mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}$.

If w is a simple reflection s_i, then $\sigma(\mathbf{C})$ intersects only $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},s_i}$, i.e. by the definition of $\varrho^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{b}}$, θ is the multiple of α_i, which is impossible.

Hence, we can assume that $\ell(w) > 1$, and let w' be such that $w = w' \cdot s_i$, $\ell(w') = \ell(w) - 1$. We claim that we will be able to find $\sigma' \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $\sigma'(\mathbf{C}) \cap \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w'} \neq \emptyset$.

Indeed, the group SL_2 corresponding to $i \in I$ acts on $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$, and the corresponding $N^-_i \subset SL_2$ preserves the point $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}}$. Hence, N^-_i acts on $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$, and, being connected, it preserves the connected component $\mathbf{K}$. However, for any non-trivial element $u \in N^-_i$, $u(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}) \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w'}$. Hence, if we define σ' as $u(\sigma)$, for the same point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$, $\sigma'(\mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w'}$.

□

Remark. For finite dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$ the above Proposition is not new, see [Th], [FFKM], [KiP], [Pe]. However all the proofs avoiding factorization use Kleiman's theorem on generic transversality, unavailable in the infinite dimensional setting.

Corollary 2.26. *The dimension of* $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ *equals* $2|\mu|$.

Proof. Using Proposition 2.25 and Proposition 2.24, we know that $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ is irreducible. Recall the map $\varrho^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$, and consider the open subset in $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ equal to the preimage of the locus of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$ corresponding to multiplicity-free divisors.

Using (5), this reduces us to the case, when μ is a simple coroot α_i, $i \in I$. But as we have seen before, the scheme $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ in this case is isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^2$.

□

Note that since the base $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$ is smooth, from the above corollary it follows that for any point $\mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$, every irreducible component of the preimage of the corresponding point $\mu \cdot \mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$ in $\mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ is of dimension $\geq |\mu|$.

The following Conjecture will be established in the case when $\mathfrak{g}$ of finite and affine type:

Conjecture 2.27. *The projection* $\varrho^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathrm{Maps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$ *is flat. Equivalently, the preimage of the point* $\mu \cdot \mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\mu}$ *(for any point* $\mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$*) is equidimensional of dimension* $|\mu|$.

For a parabolic $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\theta \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ equal to the projection of $\widetilde{\theta} = \sum n_i \cdot \alpha_i \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ with $i \notin \mathfrak{m}$, define $|\theta|$ as $\sum n_i$, and $|\theta|' = |\theta| - \langle \widetilde{\theta}, \check{\rho}_M \rangle$, where $\check{\rho}_M$ is half the sum of positive roots of $\mathfrak{m}$.

Corollary 2.28. *The dimension of* $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ *equals* $2|\theta|'$.

Proof. Pick an element $\check{\mu} \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, which projects to θ under $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}} \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, and which is sufficiently dominant with respect to $\mathfrak{m}$, so that the map $\mathrm{Bun}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{c})$ is smooth.

It is sufficient to show that for any such μ,

$$\dim\left((\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\mathbf{c})}{\times} \mathrm{Bun}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})\right) =$$
$$2|\theta|' + \text{dim. rel.}\left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}}), \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{c})\right).$$

However, according to Lemma 2.9 and Corollary 2.26, the left-hand side of the above expression equals $2|\mu|$, and dim. rel. $\left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}}), \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{c})\right)$ is readily seen to equal $\langle \mu, 2\check{\rho}_M \rangle$. Together, this yields the desired result.

□

2.29. **Enhanced quasi-maps.** For an element $\check{\lambda} \in \check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g}}$, let $\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}}$ denote the corresponding integrable module over the Levi M. Note that each such $\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}}$ can be realized as $(\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathfrak{p}^-}$. Therefore, every map of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\nu}} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check{\mu}} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}}$, gives rise to a map $\mathcal{U}_{\check{\nu}} \to \mathcal{U}_{\check{\mu}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}}$.

Consider the subscheme

$$\widetilde{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \subset \prod_{\check{\Lambda}^+_{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}}, \mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})$$

given by the following equations:

A system of maps $\varphi_{\check\lambda} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda}, \mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})$ belongs to $\widetilde{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ if for every $\check\nu, \check\lambda, \check\mu \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and a map $\mathcal{V}_{\check\nu} \to \mathcal{V}_{\check\mu} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V}_{\check\nu} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{V}_{\check\mu} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda} \\ {\scriptstyle \varphi_{\check\nu}}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle \varphi_{\check\mu}\otimes\varphi_{\check\lambda}}\downarrow \\ \mathcal{U}_{\check\nu} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{U}_{\check\mu} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda} \end{array} \tag{6}$$

is commutative.

There is a natural map from $\widetilde{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ to $C(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, which remembers the data of $\varphi_{\check\lambda}$ for $\check\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. Let $\overset{\circ}{\widetilde{C}}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ be the open subscheme of $\widetilde{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ corresponding to the condition that all the $\varphi_{\check\lambda}$ are surjections. We have a natural map

$$\overset{\circ}{\widetilde{C}}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) \to \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}},$$

and the former is a principal M-bundle over the latter.

For a (not necessarily complete) curve $\mathbf{C}$ we shall define now a certain scheme $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, called the enhanced version of the Zastava space.

By definition, $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ classifies quadruples $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_{N(P)}, \mathcal{F}_M, \kappa)$, where

- $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_{N(P)})$ are as in the definition of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$,
- $\mathcal{F}_M$ is a principal M-bundle on $\mathbf{C}$, such that the induced $M/[M,M]$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$ is identified with the one coming from D^θ,
- κ is a system of generically surjective maps

$$\kappa^{\check\lambda} : (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M},\ \check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g}},$$

such that

- The $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$'s satisfy the Plücker relations (cf. Equation (6)) and
- For $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}} \xrightarrow{\kappa^{\check\lambda}} \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}$$

equals the tautological embedding $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \to \mathcal{O}(\check\lambda(D^\theta))$.

The proof that $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is indeed representable by a scheme is given below.

One can reformulate the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ as follows: it classifies maps from $\mathbf{C}$ to the stack $N(P)\backslash\widetilde{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/M$, which send the generic point of $\mathbf{C}$ to $N(P)\backslash\mathcal{G}^e_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \simeq pt$.

From this it is easy to see that the analogs of Lemma 2.13, Corollary 2.14 and Proposition 2.19 hold. In particular, for an S-point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, on the open subset $\mathbf{C}\times S - D^\theta$, the bundles $\mathcal{F}_{N(P)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_M$ admit canonical trivializations, such that the maps $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$ become the projections $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda}$.

If $\mathbf{C}$ is a complete curve with a marked point $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$, we define the scheme of based enhanced quasi-maps $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})}{\times} \mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}).$$

I.e., $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ classifies maps from $\mathbf{C}$ to the stack $\widetilde{C}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/M$, which send a neighborhood of $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$ to $\overset{\circ}{\widetilde{C}}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})/M \simeq \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, and such that $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$ gets sent to $1_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

Just as in Proposition 2.21, when $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0, we have an isomorphism between $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, and in general the latter is a closed subscheme of the former.

When $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional, we introduce the corresponding (relative over $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})$) version of $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, denoted $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_{P^-}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})$.

2.30. To formulate the next assertion we need to recall some notation related to affine Grassmannians.

If M is a reductive group, $\mathbf{C}$ a curve, we will denote by $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ the corresponding affine Grassmannian. By definition, this is an ind-scheme classifying triples $(\mathbf{c},\mathcal{F}_M,\beta)$, where $\mathbf{c}$ is a point of $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathcal{F}_M$ is an M-bundle, and β is a trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_M$ on $\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c}$. When the point $\mathbf{c}$ is fixed, we will denote the corresponding subscheme of $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ by $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{c}}$, and sometimes simply by Gr_M.

More generally, for $a\in\mathbb{N}$, we have the Beilinson-Drinfeld version of the affine Grassmannian, denoted $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, which is now an ind-scheme over $\mathbf{C}^{(a)}$. For a fixed divisor $D\in\mathbf{C}^{(a)}$, we will denote by $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{M,\mathbf{C},D}$ the fiber of $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ over D. By definition, the latter scheme classifies pairs $(\mathcal{F}_M,\beta)$, where $\mathcal{F}_M$ is as before an M-bundle on $\mathbf{C}$, and β is its trivialization off the support of D.

Assume now that M is realized as the reductive group corresponding to a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{m}\subset\mathfrak{g}$, for a Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, and let θ be an element of $\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

We define the (finite dimensional) scheme $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ to classify triples $(D^\theta,\mathcal{F}_M,\beta)$, where D^θ is a point of $\mathbf{C}^\theta$, $\mathcal{F}_M$ is a principal M-bundle on $\mathbf{C}$, and β is a trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_M$ off the support of D^θ, such that the following conditions hold:

(1) The trivialization given by β of the induced $M/[M,M]$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$ is such that $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}\simeq\mathcal{O}(\check\lambda(D^\theta))$, $\check\lambda\in\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}$ is the line bundle associated with $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$ and the character $\check\lambda: M/[M,M]\to\mathbb{G}_m$.

(2) For an integrable $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathcal{V}$, and the corresponding $\mathfrak{m}$-module $\mathcal{U}:=\mathcal{V}^{n(\mathfrak{p})}$, the (a priori meromorphic) map $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}}\otimes\mathcal{U}\to\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{F}_M}$ induced by β, is regular.

Since M admits a faithful representation of the form $\mathcal{V}^{n(\mathfrak{p})}$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is an integrable $\mathfrak{g}$-module, we obtain that $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ is indeed finite-dimensional.

Let us describe more explicitly the fibers of $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ over $\mathbf{C}^\theta$. For simplicity, let us take a point in $\mathbf{C}^\theta$ equal to $\theta\cdot\mathbf{c}$, where $\mathbf{c}$ is some point of $\mathbf{C}$. Recall that the entire affine Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{c}}$ is the union of Schubert cells, denoted $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{M,\mathbf{c}}$, where μ runs over the set of dominant coweights of M. It is easy to see that the fiber of $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ over $\theta\cdot\mathbf{c}$, being a closed subscheme in $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{c}}$, contains (equivalently, intersects) $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{M,\mathbf{c}}$ if and only if the followinng two conditions hold:

(1) The projection of μ under $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}=\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}\to\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ equals θ.

(2) $w_0^M(\mu)\in\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, where w_0^M is the longest element of the Weyl group of M.

In particular, for a given θ, there is only a finite many of such μ, a fact that follows alternatively from the above finite-dimensionality statement.

Note that there is a canonical map $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}}:\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\to\mathcal{Z}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, which remembers the data of $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$, and $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$ for $\check\lambda\in\check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism over the open subset $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$.

Lemma 2.31. *We have a closed embedding (of functors)* $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathbf{C}^\theta}{\times} \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$.

This lemma implies, in particular, that both $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ are representable, being closed subfunctors of representable functors.

Proof. For an S-point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, we already know that the corresponding M-bundle admits a trivialization on $\mathbf{C} \times S - D^\theta$.

Moreover, if $\mathcal{U}^{\check\lambda}$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-module with $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the corresponding map $\beta^{\check\lambda} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M}$ equals the composition

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M}, \tag{7}$$

where the first arrow comes from the embedding $\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda} \simeq (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})^{\mathfrak{n}(\mathfrak{p})} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda}$.

This proves that $\mathcal{F}_M$ with its trivialization indeed defines a point of $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$.

Conversely, given a point of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, and an M-bundle $\mathcal{F}_M$ trivialized on $\mathbf{C} \times S - D^\theta$, from Lemma 2.13 we obtain that there is a meromorphic map $\kappa^{\check\lambda} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M}$. Our data defines a point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ if and only if $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$ is regular, which is a closed condition.

□

We will denote by ϱ^θ_M the projection $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$.

2.32. Let us once again assume that $\mathbf{C}$ is complete. We will introduce yet two more versions of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ (denoted $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, and $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, respectively, and called the twisted Zastava spaces), which will be fibered over the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ classifying M-bundles on $\mathbf{C}$.

By definition, $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ classifies the data of $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_P, \mathcal{F}_M, \kappa)$, where $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_M)$ are as before, $\mathcal{F}_P$ is a principal P-bundle on $\mathbf{C}$, and κ is a collection of maps

$$\kappa^{\check\lambda} : (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M},\ \check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g}},$$

which are generically surjective and satisfy the Plücker relations, and for $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ the compositions $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_M}$ induce isomorphisms $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_M} \simeq \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_P}(\check\lambda(D^\theta))$.

The stack $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ classifies triples $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_P, \kappa)$, where $(D^\theta, \mathcal{F}_P)$ are as above, and κ are collections of maps $\kappa^{\check\lambda} : (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{N(P)} \to \mathcal{O}(\check\lambda(D^\theta))$, defined for $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. The forgetful map $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ will be denoted by the same character $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

We have an open substack $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \subset \mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ that corresponds to the condition that the maps $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$ are surjective. Over it, $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism.

We have a projection, that we will call $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, from both $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ to the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ that "remembers" the data of the M-bundle $\mathcal{F}'_M := N(P)\backslash\mathcal{F}_P$. In the case of $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ we have also the other projection to $\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$, denoted $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{p}^-}$, that "remembers" the data of $\mathcal{F}_M$. Of course, the preimage of the trivial bundle $\mathcal{F}^0_M \in \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ under $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ identifies with the schemes $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, respectively.

It is easy to see that Lemma 2.13, Corollary 2.14 and Proposition 2.19 generalize to the context of twisted Zastava spaces. In particular, we have the following assertion:

Lemma 2.33. *Let $\phi_1, \phi_2 : S \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ be two arrows, such that the corresponding M-bundles on $\mathbf{C} \times S$ are identified over an open subset $U \subset \mathbf{C} \times S$. In addition let D^θ be the graph of a map $S \to \mathbf{C}^\theta$, such that $D^\theta \subset U$. Then the two Cartesian products $S \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}) \times \mathbf{C}^\theta}{\times} \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$,*

taken with respect to either ϕ_1 or ϕ_2 are naturally isomorphic; and a similar assertion holds for $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$.

This lemma implies that $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ are algebraic stacks, such that the morphism $\mathfrak{q}_\mathfrak{p}$ is representable.

As in the case of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, we have a stratification of $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ by locally-closed substacks of the form $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta'}$ for $\theta',\theta-\theta'\in\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. To describe the preimages of these strata in $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ we need to introduce some notation:

Let $\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ be the Hecke stack, i.e. a relative over $\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ version of $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, which classifies quadruples $(\mathbf{c},\mathcal{F}_M,\mathcal{F}'_M,\beta)$, where $\mathbf{c}$ is a point of $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathcal{F}_M,\mathcal{F}'_M$ are principal M-bundles on $\mathbf{C}$, and β is an identification $\mathcal{F}_M\simeq\mathcal{F}'_M|_{\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c}}$. Let $\mathcal{H}^{BD,a}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, $\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ be the corresponding relative versions of $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ and $\mathrm{Mod}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, respectively. We will denote by $\overleftarrow{h}$, $\overrightarrow{h}$ the two projections from any of the stacks $\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, $\mathcal{H}^{BD,a}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ or $\mathrm{Mod}^{+,\theta}_{M,\theta}$ to $\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ that "remember" the data of $\mathcal{F}_M$ and $\mathcal{F}'_M$, respectively.

Note that we have a canonical (convolution) map $\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}\underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}}{\times}\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}\to\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, which sends $(\mathbf{c},\mathcal{F}_M,\mathcal{F}'_M,\beta)\times(\mathbf{c},\mathcal{F}'_M,\mathcal{F}''_M,\beta')$ to $(\mathbf{c},\mathcal{F}_M,\mathcal{F}''_M,\beta'')$, where $\beta''=\beta'\circ\beta$. Similarly, we have a map $\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}\underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times}\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}}\to\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta+\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, that covers the addition map $\mathbf{C}^\theta\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta'}\to\mathbf{C}^{\theta+\theta'}$.

As in the case of $\mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, we have a map $\varrho^\theta_M:\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\to\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, such that the map

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\hookrightarrow\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}\underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times}\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$$

is a closed embedding, and such that the maps $\mathfrak{q}_\mathfrak{p}$, $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{p}^-}$ are the compositions of ϱ^θ_M with $\overleftarrow{h}$ and $\overrightarrow{h}$, respectively.

Proposition 2.34. *The preimage of a stratum $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta'}$ in $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ is isomorphic to $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times}\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, where the projections from $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ to $\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ are $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{p}^-}$- and $\overleftarrow{h}$, respectively.*

By fixing the P-bundle $\mathcal{F}_P$ (resp., the M-bundle $N(P)\backslash\mathcal{F}_P$) to be trivial, we obtain the description of the corresponding strata in $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, respectively.

Proof. Given a point of $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ factoring through $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}^{\theta'}$, we have a triple $(\mathcal{F}_P,\mathcal{F}^1_M,\kappa)$:

$$(\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_P}\xrightarrow{\kappa^\theta}(\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}^1_M}$$

where the maps κ^θ are surjections.

Then it is clear that the scheme of possible $\mathcal{F}_M$'s with $\beta:\mathcal{F}_M\simeq\mathcal{F}^1_M|_{\mathbf{C}-D^{\theta'}}$ such that the (a priori meromorphic) maps

$$(\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_P}\xrightarrow{\kappa^\theta}(\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_M}$$

continue to be regular, identifies with the fiber of $\mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$ over ${\mathcal{F}^1}_M\in\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$.

□

We will denote by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the embedding of the last stratum $\mathcal{H}^{\theta,+}_{M,\mathbf{C}} \to \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$. Note that in terms of the above proposition, the composition

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}} \to \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \xrightarrow{\varrho^{\theta}_M} \mathcal{H}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$$

equals

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^{\theta-\theta'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}} \xrightarrow{\varrho^{\theta-\theta'}_M \times \mathrm{id}} \mathcal{H}^{+,\theta-\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}} \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{+,\theta'}_{M,\mathbf{C}} \to \mathcal{H}^{+,\theta}_{M,\mathbf{C}}.$$

2.35. **The meromorphic case.** Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a scheme, and $D_{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathbf{C}\times\mathcal{X}$ a relative Cartier divisor disjoint from $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathcal{X}$. We will now develop a notion of a meromorphic quasi-map parallel to Sect. 1.19. These will appear in the following two contexts.

First, let $\mathfrak{g}$ be finite-dimensional, and let $\mathcal{F}_G$ be a principal G-bundle defined on $\mathbf{C}\times\mathcal{X} - D_{\mathcal{X}}$, trivialized along $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathcal{X}$. Let ${}_{\infty\cdot D_{\mathcal{X}}}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{F}_G \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ be the functor on the category of schemes over $\mathcal{X}$, that assigns to a test scheme S the data of $(\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}, \kappa^{\check\lambda}, \check\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, where $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$ is a principal $M/[M,M]$-bundle defined on $\mathbf{C}\times S$, and the $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$'s are maps

$$\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}|_{(\mathbf{C}\times\mathcal{X}-D_{\mathcal{X}})\underset{\mathcal{X}}{\times} S} \to (\mathcal{V}^*_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_G}, \tag{8}$$

satisfying the Plücker equations, with a prescribed value at $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times S$ corresponding to the trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_G$. The functor ${}_{\infty\cdot D_{\mathcal{X}}}\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is representable by a strict ind-scheme of ind-finite type, by Proposition 1.20.

Similarly, we define the ind-scheme ${}_{\infty\cdot D_{\mathcal{X}}}\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{F}_G \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, where instead of a $M/[M,M]$-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$, we have an M-bundle $\mathcal{F}_M$, and the maps $\kappa^{\check\lambda} : (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_G} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M}$ are defined for all $\check\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and satisfy the Plücker relations in the sense of (6).

Let now $\mathfrak{g}$ be arbitrary. We define ${}_{\infty\cdot D_{\mathcal{X}}}\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ to be the ind-scheme, which is the union over $\nu \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ of schemes, classifying the data of $(\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}, \kappa^{\check\lambda}, \check\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$, where $\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}$ is a principal $M/[M,M]$-bundle on $\mathbf{C}\times S$, and the $\kappa^{\check\lambda}$'s are maps

$$\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_{M/[M,M]}}(-\langle\nu,\check\lambda\rangle \cdot D_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathbf{C}\times S}) \to \mathcal{V}^*_{\check\lambda},$$

satisfying the Plücker relations, with the prescribed value at $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times S$. The ind-scheme ${}_{\infty\cdot D_{\mathcal{X}}}\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is defined similarly, but where the union goes over $\nu \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

3. Bundles on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$

In this section $\mathbf{C}$ will be a projective curve of genus 0 with a marked infinity $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$, and $\infty_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$ will be another such curve. We will be interested in the surface $\mathbf{S}' := \mathbf{C}\times\mathbf{X}$, and we will call $\mathbf{D}'_\infty := \mathbf{C}\times\infty_{\mathbf{X}} \cup \infty_{\mathbf{C}}\times\mathbf{X} \subset \mathbf{S}'$ the divisor at infinity.

Throughout this section $\mathfrak{g}$ will be a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra, and G the corresponding simply-connected group.

3.1. Consider the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ that classifies G-bundles on $\mathbf{S}'$ with a trivialization on $\mathbf{D}'_\infty$. We will see shortly that $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ is in fact a scheme. We have

$$\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) = \underset{a\in\mathbb{N}}{\cup} \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty),$$

where $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ corresponds to G-bundles with second Chern class equal to a. (It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ contains no points with a negative Chern class.)

Recall now that $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ denotes the stack classifying G-bundles on $\mathbf{X}$ with a trivialization at $\infty_{\mathbf{X}}$. The stack $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ contains an open subset corresponding to the *trivial bundle*, which is isomorphic to pt. Since $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ is smooth, the complement $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}}) - pt$, being of codimension 1, is a Cartier divisor. I.e., we are in the situation of Sect. 2.16. We will denote the corresponding line bundle on $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})}$.

We will use a short-hand notation of $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}}))$ for the functor of based maps from $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ that send $\infty_{\mathbf{C}}$ to $pt \subset \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$. By definition,

$$\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})) = \underset{a \in \mathbb{N}}{\cup} \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})),$$

where each $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ corresponds to maps σ such that $\sigma^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})})$ is of degree a. Since $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})}$ comes equipped with a section, we obtain a map $\varpi_h^a : \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$.

We have an obvious isomorphism of functors:

$$\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \simeq \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})). \tag{9}$$

The following assertion is left to the reader:

Lemma 3.2. *Under the above isomorphism,* $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ *maps to* $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}}))$.

In particular, we obtain a map $\varpi_h^a : \mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$. By interchanging the roles of $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{C}$, we obtain a map $\varpi_v^a : \mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

3.3. Let $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ denote the "thick" Grassmannian corresponding to G and the curve $\mathbf{X}$. I.e., $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ is the scheme classifying pairs, $(\mathcal{F}_G, \beta)$, where $\mathcal{F}_G$ is a G-bundle on $\mathbf{X}$, and β is a trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_G$ over the formal neighborhood of $\mathcal{D}_{\infty_{\mathbf{X}}}$ of $\infty_{\mathbf{X}}$.

As we shall recall later, $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ is one of the partial flag schemes associated to the affine Kac-Moody algebra corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}$. The unit point $1_{\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}}$ is the pair $(\mathcal{F}_G^0, \beta_{taut})$, where $\mathcal{F}_G^0$ is the trivial bundle and β_{taut} is its tautological trivialization. In particular, the scheme of based maps $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$ makes sense. (And we know from Proposition 2.7 that it is locally of finite type and smooth.)

Moreover, $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ carries a very ample line bundle that will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}}$, which is in fact the pull-back of the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})}$ under the natural projection $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}} \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$. This enables us to define the scheme of based quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$, studied in the previous section.

Recall also that over the symmetric power $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ we have the ind-scheme $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$, classifying pairs $(D, \mathcal{F}_G, \beta)$, where $D \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, $\mathcal{F}_G$ is a G-bundle on $\mathbf{X}$, and β is its trivialization off the support of D. We have a section $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)} \to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$, which also corresponds to the trivial bundle with a tautological trivialization. We will denote by $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})$ the (ind)-scheme of based relative maps $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$. By definition, this is an ind-scheme over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

There exists a natural map $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, which corresponds to the restriction of the trivialization on $\mathbf{X} - D$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\infty_{\mathbf{X}}}$. It is easy to see that this map is in fact a closed embedding. Moreover, the restriction $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}}$ of the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}}$ to $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$ is relatively very ample. Therefore, we can introduce the ind-scheme if based quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})$.

Proposition 3.4. *The natural morphisms*

$$\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$$

are all isomorphisms. The resulting map $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ *coincides with the map* ϖ^a_v.

Proof. Let us show first that any map $S \to \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ (for any test scheme S) lifts to a map $S \to \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$. Indeed, given a G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ on $\mathbf{S}' \times S$ and using the map ϖ^a_v we obtain a divisor $D^v \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} \times S$, such that $\mathcal{F}_G$ is trivialized on $\mathbf{C} \times (\mathbf{X} \times S - D^v)$. But this by definition means that we are dealing with a based map $\mathbf{C} \times S \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$, which covers the map $S \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ corresponding to D^v.

To prove the proposition it remains to show that if $\mathcal{F}_G$ is a G-bundle in $S \times \mathbf{S}'$ equipped with two trivializations on $\mathbf{C} \times \mathcal{D}_{\infty_{\mathbf{X}}} \times S$, which agree on $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathcal{D}_{\infty_{\mathbf{X}}} \times S$, then these two trivializations coincide.

Indeed, the difference between the trivializations is a map from $\mathbf{C} \times S$ to the group of automorphisms of the trivial G-bundle on $\mathcal{D}_{\infty_{\mathbf{X}}}$. And since $\mathbf{C}$ is complete and the group in question is pro-affine, any such map is constant along the $\mathbf{C}$ factor.

□

3.5. Using Proposition 2.24 we obtain that the scheme $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ is smooth. Moreover, we claim that $\dim(\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)) = 2 \cdot \check{h} \cdot a$, where $\check{h}$ is the dual Coxeter number. One way to see this is via Corollary 2.28, and another way is as follows:

The tangent space to $\mathcal{F}_G \subset \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ at a point corresponding to a G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ equals $H^1(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}'))$. Note that the vector bundle corresponding $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}$ has zero first Chern class, and the second Chern class equals $2 \cdot \check{h} \cdot a$.

Since points of $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ have no automorphisms, we obtain that $H^0(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}')) = 0$, and by Serre duality we obtain that $H^2(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}')) \simeq H^0(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}^*_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}'))^* = 0$. Hence, the dimension of $H^1(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}'))$ can be calculated by the Riemann-Roch formula, which yields $2 \cdot \check{h} \cdot a$. Note that this calculation in fact reproves that $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ is smooth, since we have shown that all the tangent spaces have the same dimension.

Let $0_{\mathbf{X}} \subset \mathbf{X}$ be another point, and let us denote by $\mathbf{D}'_0 \subset \mathbf{S}'$ the divisor $\mathbf{C} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}}$. By taking restriction of G-bundles we obtain a map from $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ to $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$.

Lemma 3.6. *The above map* $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$ *is smooth.*

Proof. Since both $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ and $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$ are smooth, it suffices to check the surjectivity of the corresponding map on the level of tangent spaces:

$$H^1(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}')) \to H^1(\mathbf{C}, \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}|_{\mathbf{D}'_0}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}})).$$

By the long exact sequence, the cokernel is given by $H^2(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}' - \mathbf{D}'_0))$, and we claim that this cohomology group vanishes. Indeed, by Serre duality, it suffices to show that $H^0(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathbf{X})) = 0$, and we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to H^0(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\mathbf{D}')) \to H^0(\mathbf{S}', \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathbf{X})) \to H^0(\mathbf{C}, \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}|_{\mathbf{C} \times \infty_{\mathbf{X}}}(-\infty_{\mathbf{C}}))...$$

We know already that the first term vanishes (since $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ is a scheme) and the last term vanishes too (since $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}|_{\mathbf{C} \times \infty_{\mathbf{X}}}$ is trivial). □

As another corollary of Proposition 3.4 we obtain the following factorization property of $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ with respect to the projection ϖ^a_h (and by symmetry, with respect to ϖ^a_v):

$$\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \simeq \tag{10}$$

$$(\mathrm{Bun}^{a_1}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \times \mathrm{Bun}^{a_2}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj}. \tag{11}$$

3.7. **Relation with affine Lie algebras.** Let $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$ be another chosen point, and let x be a coordinate on $\mathbf{X}$ with $x(0_{\mathbf{X}}) = \infty$, $x(\infty_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_{aff} \simeq \mathfrak{g}((x)) \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C} \oplus d \cdot \mathbb{C}$ be the corresponding untwisted affine Kac-Moody algebra, such that the element d acts via the derivation $x \cdot \partial_x$. We will denote by $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}$ the derived algebra of $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{g}((x)) \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C}$.

The lattice $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}}$ is by definition the direct sum $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \delta \cdot \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, and we will denote by $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the direct sum of the first two factors, i.e. the cocharacter lattice of the corresponding derived group. (The other factor can be largely ignored, since, for example, the semi-group $\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}}$ is contained in $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, and we will sometimes write $\widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ instead of $\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}}$.) We will write an element $\mu \in \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ as $(\overline{\mu}, a)$ for $\overline{\mu} \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. By definition, the element $\delta \in \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ equals $(0, 1)$.

Let $\overline{\alpha}_0$ denote the positive coroot of $\mathfrak{g}$ dual to the long dominant root. The simple affine coroot α_0 equals $(-\overline{\alpha}_0, 1)$. Note that $(\overline{\mu}, a) \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ if and only if $a \geq 0$ and $\overline{\mu} + a \cdot \overline{\alpha}_0 \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

We will denote by $\mathfrak{g}^+_{aff}$ (resp., $\mathfrak{g}^-_{aff}$) the subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}[[x]] \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C} \oplus d \cdot \mathbb{C}$ (resp., $\mathfrak{g}[x^{-1}] \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C} \oplus d \cdot \mathbb{C}$). These algebras are the maximal parabolic and its opposite corresponding to $I \subset I_{aff}$. The corresponding partial flag scheme $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}, \mathfrak{g}^+_{aff}}$ identifies with $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$. Note that the latter does not depend on the choice of the point $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$.

If $P \subset G$ is a parabolic and P^- is the corresponding opposite parabolic, let us denote by $\mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}$ the scheme classifying triples $(\mathcal{F}_G, \beta, \gamma)$, where $(\mathcal{F}_G, \beta)$ are as in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$, and γ is the data of a reduction to P of the fiber of $\mathcal{F}_G$ at $0_{\mathbf{X}}$.

We will denote by $\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}$ the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^+_{aff}$ consisting of elements whose value modulo x belongs to $\mathfrak{p}$. Similarly, we will denote by $\mathfrak{p}^-_{aff}$ the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^-_{aff}$ consisting of elements whose value modulo x^{-1} belongs to $\mathfrak{p}^-$. The corresponding Lie algebras $\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}, \mathfrak{p}^-_{aff}$ are a parabolic and its opposite in $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$, and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}, \mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} \simeq \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}$. The Levi subgroup corresponding to $\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}$ is $M \times \mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{G}_m$; we will denote by M_{aff} the group $M \times \mathbb{G}_m$ corresponding to the first $\mathbb{G}_m$-factor.

The lattice $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}, \mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ is the direct sum $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \oplus \delta \cdot \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, and we will denote by $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \subset \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}, \mathfrak{p}_{aff}}$ the direct sum of the first two factors. For $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} := \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}, \mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$, we have the corresponding scheme $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$.

Thus, for a projective curve $\mathbf{C}$, we can consider the schemes of based maps $\mathrm{Maps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$ for $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. For $\theta = (\overline{\theta}, a)$, consider the stack $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ that classifies the data of a G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G \in \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$, and equipped with a reduction to P on $\mathbf{D}'_0$ of weight $\overline{\theta}$, compatible with the above trivialization on $\mathbf{D}'_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}'_0 = \infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \infty_{\mathbf{X}}$.

From Proposition 3.4 we obtain an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0) \simeq \mathrm{Maps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}). \tag{12}$$

We can also consider the scheme of based quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$. We will denote by $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ the map $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta$.

In addition, we have the scheme of enhanced based quasi-maps $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$. We have a projection denoted $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$, and a map $\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{X}}$, such that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta}{\times} \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$$

is a closed embedding.

Note that the map $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ is not an isomorphism even when $P = G$. But it is, of course, an isomorphism when $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$.

3.8. Finally, let us show that the scheme $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) = \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ is globally of finite type. Using Equation (12), this would imply that the schemes $\mathrm{Maps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})$ are also of finite type.

Using Proposition 3.4, it suffices to show that any map $\sigma : \mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ of degree a has its image in a fixed finite-dimensional subscheme of $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$. To simplify the notation, we will fix a divisor $D \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ and consider based maps $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$.

Write $D = \sum\limits_k n_k \cdot \mathbf{x}_k$ with $\mathbf{x}_k$ pairwise distinct. Then $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$ is the product of the affine Grassmannians $\prod\limits_k \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{x}_k}$ and consider the subscheme $\prod\limits_k \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{n_k\cdot\overline{\alpha}_0}_{G,\mathbf{x}_k} \subset \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$, where for a dominant coweight $\overline{\lambda}$ of G, $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{\overline{\lambda}}_{G,\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the corresponding finite-dimensional subscheme of $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_{G,\mathbf{x}}$.

Lemma 3.9. *For $D \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ as above, any based map $\sigma : \mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$ of degree a has its image in the subscheme $\prod\limits_k \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{n_k\cdot\overline{\alpha}_0}_{G,\mathbf{x}_k}$.*

Of course, an analogous statement holds globally, i.e. when D moves along $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

Proof. For a fixed point $\mathcal{F}_G \in \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$, let $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}}$ be the corresponding based map $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$, and let $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}$ be the corresponding based map $\mathbf{X} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{C}}$.

Let us fix a point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$, which we may as well call $0_{\mathbf{C}}$. We must show that the value of $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}}$ at $0_{\mathbf{C}}$ belongs to $\prod\limits_k \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{n_k\cdot\overline{\alpha}_0}_{G,\mathbf{x}_k} \subset \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$.

From Sect. 3.7, we have a map $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{C}}) \to \mathrm{Mod}^{a,+}_{G_{aff},\mathbf{X}}$ covering the map $\varpi^a_v : \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{C}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

Now, it is easy to see that for our map $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}$, $\varpi^a_v(\sigma_{\mathbf{X}}) = D$ and the fiber of $\mathrm{Mod}^{a,+}_{G_{aff},\mathbf{X}}$ at D is a closed subscheme of $\prod\limits_k \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{n_k\cdot\overline{\alpha}_0}_{G,\mathbf{x}_k}$, cf. [BFGM], Prop. 1.7; moreover this embedding induces an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes. The resulting point of $\prod\limits_k \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{n_k\cdot\overline{\alpha}_0}_{G,\mathbf{x}_k}$ equals the value of $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}}$ at $0_{\mathbf{C}}$, which is what we had to show.

□

Part II: Uhlenbeck spaces

Throughout Part II, G will be a simple simply-connected group and $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra. When $G = SL_n$, the subscript "SL_n" will often be replaced by just "n".

4. Definition of Uhlenbeck spaces

4.1. **Rational surfaces.** As was explained in the introduction, Uhlenbeck spaces $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ are attached to the surface $\mathbf{S} \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ with a distinguished "infinity" line $\mathbf{D}_\infty \simeq \mathbb{P}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. However, in order to define $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, we will need to replace $\mathbf{S}$ by all possible rationally equivalent surfaces isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Let $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}} \subset \mathbf{S}$ denote the affine plane $\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{D}_\infty$. For two distinct points $\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$ we obtain a decomposition of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ as a product of two affine lines (horizontal and vertical):

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}} \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}},$$

where $\mathbf{d}_v$ corresponds to the class of parallel lines in $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ that project to a single point in $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$, and similarly for $\mathbf{d}_h$. Let $\mathbf{C} := \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \cup \infty_{\mathbf{C}}$, $\mathbf{X} := \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} \cup \infty_{\mathbf{X}}$ be the corresponding projective lines.

Let us denote by $\mathbf{S}'$ the surface $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X}$, and by π_v, π_h the projections from $\mathbf{S}'$ to $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{X}$, respectively. Let $\mathbf{D}'_\infty := \infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathbf{X} \cup \mathbf{C} \times \infty_{\mathbf{X}}$ be the corresponding divisor "of infinity" in $\mathbf{S}'$. The surfaces $\mathbf{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}'$ are connected by a flip-flop. Namely, let $\mathbf{S}''$ be the blow-up of $\mathbf{S}$ at the two points $\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h$. Then $\mathbf{S}'$ is obtained from $\mathbf{S}''$ by blowing down the proper transform of $\mathbf{D}_\infty$.

In particular, it is easy to see that (a family of) G-bundles on $\mathbf{S}$ trivialized along $\mathbf{D}_\infty$ is the same as (a family of) G-bundles on $\mathbf{S}'$ trivialized along $\mathbf{D}'_\infty$.

4.2. Let O denote the variety $\mathbf{D}_\infty \times \mathbf{D}_\infty - \Delta(\mathbf{D}_\infty)$, i.e., the variety classifying pairs of distinct points $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$, and let us consider the "relative over O" versions of the varieties discussed above.

In particular, we have the relative affine (resp., projective) lines $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathsf{O}}$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}}$, $\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}$), and the relative surface $\mathbf{S}'_{\mathsf{O}}$. Let $\pi_{v,\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $\pi_{h,\mathsf{O}}$) denote the projection $\mathbf{S}'_{\mathsf{O}} \to \mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $\mathbf{S}'_{\mathsf{O}} \to \mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}$.) We will denote by $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}$ the corresponding fibrations into symmetric powers.

Let us recall the following general construction. Suppose that $\mathcal{Y}_1$ is a scheme (of finite type), and $\mathcal{Y}_2 \to \mathcal{Y}_1$ is an affine morphism (also of finite type). Then the functor on the category of schemes, that sends a test scheme S to the set of sections (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_1$-maps) $S \times \mathcal{Y}_1 \to \mathcal{Y}_2$, is representable by an affine ind-scheme of ind-finite type, which we will denote by $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$.

(To show the representability, it is enough to assume that $\mathcal{Y}_2$ is a total space of a vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$, in which case $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ is representable by the vector space $\Gamma(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{E})$.)

For example, by applying this construction to $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \mathsf{O}$, we obtain the ind-schemes $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$, $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$, $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}} \underset{\mathsf{O}}{\times} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$.

4.3. We are now ready to give the first definition of the Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

For a fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$, i.e., a point of O, and a divisor $D_v \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, consider the scheme of based quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D_v})$, cf. Sect. 1.11. This ind-scheme is ind-affine, of ind-finite type, cf. Lemma 1.6.

By making $D_v \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ a parameter, we obtain an ind-affine ind-scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$ fibered over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$. Finally, by letting $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$ move, we obtain ind-affine fibrations

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}} \to \mathsf{O}.$$

Thus, we can consider the ind-scheme $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$. By construction, we have a natural map

$$\varpi^a_{v,\mathsf{O}} : \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}).$$

When a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$ is fixed, by further evaluation we obtain the map $\varpi^a_v : \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

Now, we claim that we have a natural map

$$\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}).$$

Indeed, constructing such a map amounts to giving a map $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$ for every pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$, but this has been done in the previous section, Proposition 3.4.

Since $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ is a scheme, its image in $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$ is contained in a closed subscheme of finite type. In fact, it is contained in the subscheme described in Sect. 3.8.

Definition 4.4. *We define* $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ *to be the closure of the image of* $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ *in the ind-scheme* $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$.

By construction, $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is an affine scheme of finite type, which functorially depends on the pair $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$.

Lemma 4.5. *The map* $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ *is an open embedding.*

Proof. Let us fix a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$ and consider the corresponding evaluation map $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$. We have a composition:

$$\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to$$
$$\to \mathfrak{U}^a_G \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty).$$

Since $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ is dense in $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, we obtain that all arrows in the above formula are isomorphisms. The assertion of the lemma follows since $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$ is clearly open in $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

□

4.6. We will now give two more definitions of the space $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, which, on the one hand, are more economical, but on the other hand possess less symmetry. Of course, later we will establish the equivalence of all the definitions.

Let us fix a point $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$ and consider the space of quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$. As we have seen in the previous section, this is an affine scheme of infinite type.

We have a natural map

$$\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}),$$

constructed as in the previous section.

We set $'\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ to be the closure of the image of $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ in the above product. From this definition, it is not immediately clear that $'\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is of finite type.

Again, for a fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$, consider the fibration $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, and consider the corresponding fibration of quasi-maps' spaces $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$. This is an affine ind-scheme of ind-finite type.

We have a natural map

$$\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)\to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times}\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}),$$

where the projection $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})\to\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ corresponds to the evaluation at our fixed point $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$.

We set ${}''\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ to be the closure of its image. By construction, ${}''\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ is an affine scheme of finite type.

Proposition 4.7. *There is a canonical isomorphism* ${}'\mathfrak{U}_G^a\simeq{}''\mathfrak{U}_G^a$.

Proof. Recall that we have a natural map $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}\to\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$, such that the canonical line bundle on $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$ is the restriction of that on $\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$, moreover the map $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}\to\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ is a closed embedding.

Therefore, using Lemma 1.22, we obtain a closed embedding

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})\to\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}.$$

This defines a map

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times}\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})\to\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})\times\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}),$$

which is also a closed embedding. This proves the proposition.

□

We have also a natural map $\mathfrak{U}_G^a\to{}''\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, which corresponds to the evaluation map $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})\to\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})$.

Theorem 4.8. *The map* $\mathfrak{U}_G^a\to{}''\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ *is an isomorphism.*

This theorem will be proved in the next section for $G=SL_n$, and in Sect. 6.3 for G general.

4.9. We conclude this section with the following observation:

Let $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$ be a fixed pair of directions. Using Sect. 2.11, we obtain a map

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})\to\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}.$$

By composing it with $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})\to\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$, we obtain also the map $\varpi_h^a:\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})\to\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$. By making $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$ vary along O, we have, therefore, a morphism:

$$\varpi_{h,\mathsf{O}}^a:\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})\to\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}).$$

Note now that the space O carries a natural involution, which interchanges the roles of $\mathbf{d}_v$ and $\mathbf{d}_h$. In particular, we have a map $\tau:\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})\to\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$.

We will denote by $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})^\tau$ the equalizer of the two maps

$$\tau\circ\varpi_{v,\mathsf{O}}\text{ and }\varpi_{h,\mathsf{O}}:\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})\to\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}).\tag{13}$$

We have:

Lemma 4.10. $\mathfrak{U}_G^a\subset\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})^\tau$.

The proof follows from the fact that the maps $\tau\circ\varpi_{v,\mathsf{O}}$ and $\varpi_{h,\mathsf{O}}$ do coincide on $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$, cf. Proposition 3.4.

5. Comparison of the definitions: the case of SL_n

5.1. In order to prove Theorem 4.8 for SL_n, we will recall yet one more definition of Uhlenbeck spaces, essentially due to S. Donaldson. To simplify the notation, we will write $\mathfrak{U}_n^a$ instead of $\mathfrak{U}_{SL_n}^a$.

In case $G = SL_n$, the moduli space $\mathrm{Bun}_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ admits the following linear algebraic ADHM description going back to Barth (see a modern exposition in [Na]). We consider vector spaces $V = \mathbb{C}^a,\ W = \mathbb{C}^n$, and consider the affine space

$$\mathrm{End}(V) \oplus \mathrm{End}(V) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(W, V) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(V, W),$$

a typical element of which will be denoted $(B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath)$. We define a subscheme $M_n^a \subset \mathrm{End}(V) \oplus \mathrm{End}(V) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(W, V) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$ by the equation $[B_1, B_2] + \imath\jmath = 0$.

A quadruple $(B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath) \in M_n^a$ is called *stable* if V has no proper subspace containing the image of $\imath$ and invariant with respect to B_1, B_2. A quadruple $(B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath) \in M_n^a$ is called *costable* if $\mathrm{Ker}(\jmath)$ contains no nonzero subspace invariant with respect to B_1, B_2. We have the open subscheme ${}^sM_n^a \subset M_n^a$ (resp. ${}^cM_n^a \subset M_n^a$) formed by stable (resp. costable) quadruples. Their intersection ${}^sM_n^a \cap {}^cM^c$ is denoted by ${}^{sc}M_n^a$.

According to [Na] 2.1, the natural action of $GL(V)$ on ${}^sM_n^a$ (resp., ${}^cM_n^a$) is free, and the GIT quotient $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a := {}^sM_n^a/GL(V)$ is canonically isomorphic to the fine moduli space of torsion free sheaves of rank n and second Chern class a on $\mathbf{S}$ equipped with a trivialization on $\mathbf{D}_\infty$. The open subset ${}^{sc}M_n^a/GL(V) \subset {}^sM_n^a/GL(V)$ corresponds, under this identification, to the locus of vector bundles $\mathrm{Bun}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a$.

Finally, consider the categorical quotient $\mathfrak{N}_n^a := M_n^a//GL(V)$. The natural projective morphism $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a \to \mathfrak{N}_n^a$ is the affinization of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a$, i.e. $\mathfrak{N}_n^a$ is the spectrum of the algebra of regular functions on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{N}_n^a$ is reduced and irreducible and the natural map $\mathrm{Bun}_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathfrak{N}_n^a$ is an open embedding.

Our present goal is to construct a map $\mathfrak{N}_n^a \to \mathfrak{U}_n^a$ and show that the composition $\mathfrak{N}_n^a \to \mathfrak{U}_n^a \to {}'\mathfrak{U}_n^a$ is an isomorphism. The proof given below was indicated by Drinfeld, and the main step is to interpret $\mathfrak{N}_n^a$ as a coarse moduli space of *coherent perverse sheaves* (cf. [B]) on $\mathbf{S}$.

5.2. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a smooth surface.

Definition 5.3. *We will call a complex $\mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{DCoh}^{\geq 0, \leq 1}(\mathbf{S})$ a coherent perverse sheaf if*

- *$h^1(\mathcal{M})$ is a finite length sheaf.*
- *$h^0(\mathcal{M})$ is a torsion free coherent sheaf,*

Coherent perverse sheaves obviously form an additive subcategory of $\mathrm{DCoh}(X)$, denoted $\mathrm{PCoh}(X)$. It is easy to see that Serre-Grothendieck duality maps $\mathrm{PCoh}(X)$ to itself.

Lemma 5.4. *For $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathrm{PCoh}(X)$, the inner Hom satisfies $\underline{\mathrm{RHom}}^i(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2) = 0$ for $i < 0$.*

If S is a scheme, an S-family of coherent perverse sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$ is an object $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathrm{DCoh}(\mathbf{S} \times S)$, such that for every geometric point $s \in S$ the (derived) restriction $\mathcal{M}_s \in \mathrm{DCoh}(\mathbf{S})$ belongs to $\mathrm{PCoh}(\mathbf{S})$.

Lemma 5.5. *The functor Schemes $\to$ Groupoids, that assigns to a test scheme S the full subgroupoid of $\mathrm{DCoh}(\mathbf{S} \times S)$ consisting of S-families of coherent perverse sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$, is a sheaf of categories in the faithfully flat topology.*

The lemma is proved in exactly the same manner as the usual faithfully flat descent theorem for sheaves, using the fact that for two S-families of coherent perverse sheaves $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$, the cone of any arrow $\mathcal{M}_1 \to \mathcal{M}_2$ is a *canonically* defined object of $\mathrm{DCoh}(\mathbf{S} \times S)$, which follows from Lemma 5.4.

5.6. For $\mathbf{S} = \mathbb{P}^2$, consider the functor Schemes $\to$ Groupoids, denoted $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, that assigns to a test scheme S the groupoid whose objects are S-families of coherent perverse sheaves $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbf{S}$, such that:

- $\mathcal{M}$ is of generic rank n, $ch_2(\mathcal{M}) = -a$.
- In a neighborhood of $\mathbf{D}_\infty \times S \subset \mathbf{S} \times S$, $\mathcal{M}$ is a vector bundle, and its restriction to the divisor $\mathbf{D}_\infty \times S$ is trivialized.

Morphisms in this category are isomorphisms between coherent perverse sheaves (as objects in $\mathrm{DCoh}(\mathbf{S} \times S)$), which respect the trivialization at $\mathbf{D}_\infty$.

The following theorem, due to Drinfeld, is a generalization of Donaldson-Nakajima theory:

Theorem 5.7. *The functor* $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ *is representable by the stack* $M_n^a/GL(V)$.

Proof. The proof is a modification of Nakajima's argument in Chapter 2 of [Na]. Let us choose homegeneous coordiantes z_0, z_1, z_2 on $\mathbb{P}^2$, so that the line $\mathbf{D}_\infty \subset \mathbf{S}$ is given by equation $z_0 = 0$. In particular, this defines a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$.

Lemma 5.8. *For a coherent perverse sheaf* $\mathcal{M}$ *on* $\mathbf{S}$ *trivialized at* $\mathbf{D}_\infty$ *we have*

$$H^{\pm 1}(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-1)[1]) = H^{\pm 1}(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-2)[1]) = H^{\pm 1}(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M} \otimes \Omega^1[1]) = 0.$$

The proof for a torsion free sheaf (in cohomological degree 0) is given in Chapter 2 of [Na]. The statement of the Lemma obviously holds also for a finite length sheaf in cohomological degree 1, and an arbitrary $\mathcal{M}$ is an extension of such two perverse sheaves. □

Let p_1, p_2 be the two projections $\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{S} \to \mathbf{S}$, and let $C^\bullet$ be the Koszul complex on $\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{S}$, i.e., the complex

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}(-2) \boxtimes \Omega^2(2) \to \mathcal{O}(-1) \boxtimes \Omega^1(1) \to \mathcal{O} \boxtimes \mathcal{O} \to 0,$$

which is known to be quasi-isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta(\mathbf{S})}$. Then the complex of perverse coherent sheaves $p_2^*(\mathcal{M}(-1)) \otimes C^\bullet$ looks like

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}(-2) \boxtimes (\mathcal{M}(-1) \otimes \Omega^2(2)) \to \mathcal{O}(-1) \boxtimes (\mathcal{M}(-1) \otimes \Omega^1(1)) \to \mathcal{O} \boxtimes \mathcal{M}(-1) \to 0$$

The first term of the Beilinson spectral sequence for $Rp_{1*}(p_2^*(\mathcal{M}(-1)) \otimes C^\bullet) \simeq \mathcal{M}(-1)$ reduces to

$$\mathcal{O}(-2) \otimes H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-2)) \to \mathcal{O}(-1) \otimes H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M} \otimes \Omega^1) \to \mathcal{O} \otimes H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-1))$$

(in degrees $-1, 0, 1$). Hence $\mathcal{M}$ is canonically quasi-isomorphic to the complex (monad)

$$\mathcal{O}(-1) \otimes H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-2)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{O} \otimes H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M} \otimes \Omega^1) \xrightarrow{b} \mathcal{O}(1) \otimes H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-1))$$

and d is injective.

Now we are able to go from perverse sheaves to the linear algebraic data and back. We set $V = H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-2))$, $W' = H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M} \otimes \Omega^1)$, $V' = H^1(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{M}(-1))$. We have $\dim V = \dim V' = a$, and $\dim W' = 2a + n$. Since $H^0(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{O}(1))$ has a base $\{z_0, z_1, z_2\}$, we may write in the above monad $d = z_0 d_0 + z_1 d_1 + z_2 d_2$, $b = z_0 b_0 + z_1 b_1 + z_2 b_2$ where $d_i \in \mathrm{Hom}(V, W')$, $b_i \in \mathrm{Hom}(W', V')$. Nakajima checks in *loc. cit.* that $b_1 d_2 = -b_2 d_1$ is an isomorphism from V to V', and identifies V' with V via this isomorphism. Nakajima defines $W \subset W'$ as $W := \mathrm{Ker}(b_1) \cap \mathrm{Ker}(b_2)$, and identifies W' with $V \oplus V \oplus W$ via $(d_1, d_2) : V \oplus V \leftrightarrows W' : (-b_2, b_1)$. Note that $\dim W = n$. Under these identifications, we write $V \xrightarrow{d_0} V \oplus V \oplus W \xrightarrow{b_0} V$ as $d_0 = (B_1, B_2, \jmath)$, $b_0 = (-B_2, B_1, \imath)$ where $B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{End}(V)$, $\imath \in \mathrm{Hom}(W, V)$, $\jmath \in \mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$ satisfy the relation $[B_1, B_2] + \imath\jmath = 0$.

Conversely, given $V, W, B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath$ as above, we define $\mathcal{M}$ as a monad

$$V \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1) \xrightarrow{d} (V \oplus V \oplus W) \otimes \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{b} V \otimes \mathcal{O}(1)$$

(in cohomological degrees $-1, 0, 1$) where $d = (z_0B_1 - z_1, z_0B_2 - z_2, z_0\jmath)$, $b = (-z_0B_2 + z_2, z_0B_1 - z_1, z_0\imath)$. Evidently, $\mathcal{M}|_{\mathbf{D}_\infty} = W \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty}$.

□

If $\mathcal{M}$ is a coherent perverse sheaf on $\mathbf{S} = \mathbb{P}^2$ trivialized along $\mathbf{D}_\infty \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$, we will denote by the same character $\mathcal{M}$ the corresponding coherent perverse sheaf on $\mathbf{S}' = \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X}$, trivialized along the divisor $\mathbf{D}'_\infty$.

The following assertion can be deduced from the above proof of Theorem 5.7

Lemma 5.9. *The maps ϖ_h^a, ϖ_v^a from $\mathrm{Bun}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ to $(\mathbb{A}^1)^{(a)} \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$ and $(\mathbb{A}^1)^{(a)} \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, respectively (cf. Proposition 3.4), are given by the characteristic polynomials of B_1 and B_2.*

For the proof one has to observe that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a point of $\mathrm{Bun}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, corresponding to a quadruple $(B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath)$, and D_h (resp., D_v) is the divisor on $\mathbb{A}^1$ given by the characteristic polynomial of B_1 (resp., B_2), then as a bundle on $\mathbf{S}'$, $\mathcal{M}$ will be trivilialized on $(\mathbf{C} - D_h) \times \mathbf{X}$ (resp., $\mathbf{C} \times (\mathbf{X} - D_v)$).

5.10. We will now construct a map $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathfrak{U}_n^a$. First, for a fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, we will construct a map

$$\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{SL_n, \mathbf{X}}). \tag{14}$$

Thus, let $\mathcal{M}$ be an S-point of $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, or $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$. Over the open subscheme $(\mathbf{C} \times S)_0$ of $\mathbf{C} \times S$, over which $\mathcal{M}$ is a vector bundle, we do obtain a genuine map $(\mathbf{C} \times S)_0 \to \mathcal{G}_{SL_n, \mathbf{X}}$, and we have to show that this map extends as a quasi-map on the entire $\mathbf{C} \times S$.

Let us recall the description of the fundamental representation of $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n$ as a Clifford module Cliff_n, cf. [FGK], Section 2.2. Thus, we have to attach to $\mathcal{M}$ a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbf{C} \times S$, and a map

$$\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes \Lambda^\bullet \left(x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] \right) \otimes \left(\det(x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / \mathbb{C}^n[[x]]) \right)^{-1}$$

for each pair of positive integers d_1 and d_2.

Consider the (derived) direct image

$$\mathcal{N}_d := (\pi_v \times \mathrm{id})_* \Big(\mathcal{M}\big(d \cdot (\mathbf{C} \times \infty_\mathbf{X} \times S)\big) \Big).$$

This is a complex on $\mathbf{C} \times S$, whose fiber at every geometric point of $\mathbf{C} \times S$ lies in the cohomological degrees 0 and 1. Therefore, locally on $\mathbf{C} \times S$, $\mathcal{N}$ can be represented by a length-2 complex of vector bundles $\mathcal{F}_d^0 \to \mathcal{F}_d^1$. We set $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{M} := \det(\mathcal{F}_d^0) \otimes \det(\mathcal{F}_d^1)^{-1} \otimes \det(x^{-d} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / \mathbb{C}^n[[x]])$.

We have also a canonical map on $\mathbf{S}' \times S$:

$$\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{O}^{\oplus n} / \mathcal{O}^{\oplus n}\big(-d_2 \cdot (\mathbf{C} \times \infty_\mathbf{X} \times S)\big),$$

which comes from a trivialization of $\mathcal{M}$ around the divisor $\mathbf{D}'_h \times S$. Therefore, we obtain a map in the derived category $\mathcal{N}_{d_1} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes (x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]])$.

Moreover, by replacing $\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0 \to \mathcal{F}_{d_1}^1$ by a quasi-isomorphic complex of vector bundles, we can assume that the above map $\mathcal{N}_{d_1} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes (x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]])$ comes from a map $\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes (x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]])$.

Thus, we have a map $\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0 \to \mathcal{F}_{d_1}^1 \oplus \left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes (x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]]) \right)$, and, hence, a map

$$\Lambda^{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0)} \left(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0 \right) \to \Lambda^{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0)} \left(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^1 \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes (x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]]) \right) \twoheadrightarrow$$
$$\Lambda^{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^1)} \left(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^1 \right) \otimes \Lambda^{\mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^0) - \mathrm{rk}(\mathcal{F}_{d_1}^1)} \left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C} \times S} \otimes (x^{-d_1} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]] / x^{d_2} \mathbb{C}^n[[x]]) \right).$$

By tensoring both sides by $\left(\det(x^{-d_1}\mathbb{C}^n[[x]]/\mathbb{C}^n[[x]])\right)^{-1}$, we obtain a map $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}\times S} \otimes \Lambda^\bullet\left(x^{-d_1}\mathbb{C}^n[[x]]/x^{d_2}\mathbb{C}^n[[x]]\right) \otimes \left(\det(x^{-d_1}\mathbb{C}^n[[x]]/\mathbb{C}^n[[x]])\right)^{-1}$, as required.

It is easy to check that the definition of this morphism does not depend on a particular choice of a representing complex, and over $(\mathbf{C}\times S)_0$, this is the same map as the one defining the map $(\mathbf{C}\times S)_0 \to \mathcal{G}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}}$.

5.11. Thus, we have a map $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})$ for every fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$. In particular, we have a map $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$, and by letting $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$ vary, we obtain a map $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$. By interchanging the roles of $\mathbf{d}_h$, and $\mathbf{d}_v$, we obtain also a map $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$.

We claim now that for any fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$, the map

$$\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)} \times \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})$$

factors through the closed subscheme $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}}) \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)} \times \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})$. Indeed, this is so, because the corresponding fact is true over the open dense substack $\mathrm{Bun}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \subset \mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$. (The density assertion is a corollary of Theorem 5.7).

Therefore, we obtain a map

$$\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}). \tag{15}$$

The image of this map lies in $\mathfrak{U}^a_n$, because the open dense substack $\mathrm{Bun}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$ does map there. In other words, we obtain a map $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$.

In particular, from Theorem 5.7, we have a $GL(V)$-invariant map $M^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$, and since $\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ is affine, we thus have a map $\mathfrak{N}^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$.

Moreover, from Lemma 5.9 we obtain that for a fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$, the composition $M^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n \overset{\varpi^a_h}{\to} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)} \simeq (\mathbb{A}^1)^{(a)}$ is given by the map sending B_1 to its characteristic polynomial, and similarly for ϖ^a_v and B_2. Indeed, this is so because the corresponding fact holds for the open part ${}^{sc}M^a_n$.

Remark. Above we have shown that the map $\mathrm{Bun}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$ extends to a $GL(V)$-invariant map $M^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$. However, if we used the results of [FGK], the existence of the latter map could be proved differently:

In *loc. cit.* we constructed a map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$, using the interpretation of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$ as the moduli space of torsion free coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$. Since $\mathfrak{N}^a_n$ is the affinization of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$, and $\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ is affine, we do obtain a map $\mathfrak{N}^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$, and hence a map $M^a_n/GL(V) \to \mathfrak{N}^a_n$.

Theorem 5.12. *The maps $\mathfrak{N}^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n \to {}'\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ are isomorphisms.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this theorem. Since all the three varieties that appear in Theorem 5.12 have a common dense open piece, namely, $\mathrm{Bun}^a_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$, it is sufficient to prove that the map $\mathsf{f}: \mathfrak{N}^a_n \to {}'\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ is an isomorphism.

5.13. Consider the map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n \to {}'\mathfrak{U}^a_n$. It was shown in [FGK], that this map is proper. Since $\mathfrak{N}^a_n$ is an affinization of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$, we obtain that $\mathsf{f}: \mathfrak{N}^a_n \to {}'\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ is finite.

Choose a point $0_{\mathbf{S}} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, and let $0_{\mathbf{C}}$, $0_{\mathbf{X}}$ be the corresponding points on $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{X}$, respectively. Consider the corresponding action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ by dilations. By transport of structure, we obtain a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the scheme $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{\mathbf{X},SL_n})$, and on $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$.

It is easy to see that the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action contracts both these varieties to a single point. Namely, $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$ is contracted to a section, that assigns to every $(\mathbf{d}_v^1, \mathbf{d}_h^1) \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$ the point $a \cdot 0_{\mathbf{X}}$ in the symmetric power of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}$. Using Proposition 2.6, we obtain that $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})$ is contracted to the quasi-map, whose saturation is the constant map $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}}$, corresponding to the trivial bundle and tautological trivialization, with defect of order a at $0_{\mathbf{C}}$. Let us denote by $\sigma^{\mathfrak{U}}$ the attracting point of ${}'\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ described above.

The above action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ on ${}'\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ is covered by a natural $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the stack $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$. Moreover, if we identify $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ with $\mathbb{A}^2$, such that $0_{\mathbf{S}}$ corresponds to the origin, the above action on $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ corresponds to the canonical $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the variety $\mathbb{A}^2$ by homotheties.

The induced $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathfrak{N}^a_n \simeq M^a_n//GL(V)$ contracts this variety to a single point, which we will denote by $\sigma^{\mathfrak{N}}$.

Thus, it would be sufficient to show that the scheme-theoretic preimage $\mathsf{f}^{-1}(\sigma^{\mathfrak{U}})$ is in fact a point-scheme corresponding to $\sigma^{\mathfrak{N}}$.

5.14. Let $\mathsf{g}^{\mathfrak{N}}$ (resp., $\mathsf{g}^{\mathfrak{U}}$) denote the canonical map from $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ to $\mathfrak{N}^a_n$ (resp., $\mathfrak{U}^a_n$). We claim that it is sufficient to show that the inclusion $(\mathsf{g}^{\mathfrak{N}})^{-1}(z_0^{\mathfrak{N}}) \hookrightarrow (\mathsf{g}^{\mathfrak{U}})^{-1}(z_0^{\mathfrak{U}})$ is an equality. This follows from the next general observation:

Lemma 5.15. *Let $\mathcal{Y}_1$ be an affine algebraic variety (in char 0) with an action of a reductive group G. Let $\mathcal{Y}_2$ be another affine variety and $\mathsf{g} : \mathcal{Y}_1 \to \mathcal{Y}_2$ be a G-invariant map, and let us denote by $\mathsf{f} : \mathcal{Y}_1//G \to \mathcal{Y}_2$, $\mathsf{g}' : \mathcal{Y}_1 \to \mathcal{Y}_1//G$ the corresponding maps. Then if for some $z' \in \mathcal{Y}_1//G$, $z \in \mathcal{Y}_2$ with $\mathsf{f}(z') = z$ the inclusion $(\mathsf{g}')^{-1}(z) \subset (\mathsf{g})^{-1}(z')$ is an isomorphism, then $(\mathsf{f})^{-1}(z)$ is a point-scheme.*

Consider now the following ind-stack $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S} - 0_{\mathbf{S}})$: For a scheme S, its S-points are S-families of coherent perverse sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$ (with $c_1 = 0$, $ch_2 = -a$), equppied with a trivialization on $\mathbf{S} - 0_{\mathbf{S}}$ and such that for every pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$, the composition

$$S \to \mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$$

maps to the point $a \cdot 0_{\mathbf{C}} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$.

Proposition 5.16. *The composition $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S} - 0_{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathfrak{N}^a_n$ is the constant map to the point $\sigma^{\mathfrak{N}}$.*

Proof. For a triple $(B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath)$, representing a point of $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, let us denote by T_W any endomorphism of the vector space W obtained by composing the maps $B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath$, and by T_V any similarly obtained endomorphism of V.

It is easy to see that the space of regular functions on $\mathfrak{N}^a_n$ is obtained by taking matrix coefficients of all possible T_W's and traces of all possible T_V's.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an S-point of $\mathrm{Perv}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S} - 0_{\mathbf{S}})$. For an integer m, let $\mathcal{M}'$ be the (constant) S-family of coherent perverse sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$, corresponding to the torsion-free sheaf

$$\ker\left(\mathcal{O}^{\oplus n} \to \left(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}^m_{0_{\mathbf{S}}}\right)^{\oplus n}\right),$$

where $\mathfrak{m}_{0_{\mathbf{S}}}$ is the maximal ideal of the point $0_{\mathbf{S}}$. Then, when m is large enough, we can find a map $\mathcal{M}' \to \mathcal{M}$, which respects the trivializations of both sheaves on $\mathbf{S} - 0_{\mathbf{S}}$. The cone of this map is set-theoretically supported at $0_{\mathbf{S}}$ and has cohomologies in degrees 0 and 1.

Let $(V, W, B_1, B_2, \imath, \jmath)$ and $(V', W', B'_1, B'_2, \imath', \jmath')$ denote the linear algebra data corresponding to $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$, respectively. By unraveling the proof of Theorem 5.7, we obtain that there are maps $V' \to V$ and $W' \simeq W$, which commute with all the endomorphisms.

By the definition of $\mathcal{M}'$, $\jmath' = 0$. From this we obtain that all the matrices T_W vanish, and the only non-zero T_V-matrices are of the form $B_1^{k_1} \circ B_2^{k_2} \circ ... \circ B_1^{k_{m-1}}$. It remains to show that any such matrix is traceless.

Note that for any matrices T_V^1 and T_V^2 as above, the trace of $T_V^1 \circ i \circ j \circ T_V^2 \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ equals the trace of the corresponding endomorphism of V', and, hence, vanishes. The relation $[B_1, B_2] + \imath \circ \jmath = 0$ implies that the trace of a matrix $B_1^{k_1} \circ B_2^{k_2} \circ ... \circ B_1^{k_{m-1}}$ does not depend on the order of the factors. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that the characteristic polynomial of a matrix $B_1 + c \cdot B_2$ vanishes for all $c \in \mathbb{C}$.

However, using [FGK] Lemma 3.5, for any such c, we can find a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$, such that this characteristic polynomial equals to value of $M_n^a \to \mathfrak{U}_n^a \overset{\varpi_h^a}{\to} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)} \simeq (\mathbb{A}^1)^{(a)}$ at our point of M_n^a.

□

Using this proposition, we obtain that in order to prove Theorem 5.12 it would be sufficient to show that any S-point of the stack $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{U}})^{-1}(\sigma^{\mathfrak{U}})$ factors through an S-point of $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S} - 0_{\mathbf{S}})$.

5.17. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an arbitrary S-family of coherent perverse sheaves on $\mathbf{S}'$ corresponding to an S-point of $\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$. Let $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$ be a fixed configuration, and let us denote by $D_h \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times S$, $D_v \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} \times S$ the corresponding divisors.

First of all, by unfolding the definition of the map

$$\mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{SL_n, \mathbf{X}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)},$$

we obtain that $\mathcal{M}$ is a *vector bundle* away from the divisors $D_h \times \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{C} \times D_v$. (I.e. a quasi-map necessarily acquires a defect at some point of $\mathbf{C}$ if $\mathcal{M}$ has a singularity on the vertical divisor over this point.)

Moreover, when we view $\mathcal{M}|_{\mathbf{S}' \times S - \mathbf{C} \times D_v}$ as an $(\mathbf{X} \times S - D_v)$-family of bundles on $\mathbf{C}$, this family is canonically trivialized.

Consider now the restriction of $\mathcal{M}$ to the complement to $D_h \times \mathbf{X} \cup \mathbf{C} \times D_v \subset \mathbf{S} \times S$. This is a vector bundle equipped with two trivializations. One comes from the fact that we are dealing with a *map* $\mathbf{C} \times S - D_h \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{SL_n, \mathbf{X}, D_v}$, and another one comes from the trivialization of $\mathcal{M}|_{\mathbf{S}' \times S - \mathbf{C} \times D_v}$ mentioned above.

We claim that these two trivializations actually coincide. This is so, because the corresponding fact is true over the dense substack $\mathrm{Bun}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \subset \mathrm{Perv}_n^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$.

Going back to the proof of the theorem, assume that $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to an S-point of $(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{U}})^{-1}(\sigma^{\mathfrak{U}})$. Then, first of all, the divisors D_h, D_v are $(a \cdot 0_{\mathbf{C}}) \times S$ and $(a \cdot 0_{\mathbf{X}}) \times S$, respectively.

Moreover, $\mathcal{M}$ is a vector bundle away from $0_{\mathbf{S}} \times S$, and it is trivialized away from $\mathbf{C} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}} \times S \subset \mathbf{S}' \times S$. Therefore, we only have to show that this trivialization extends across the divisor $\mathbf{C} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}} \times S$ over $(\mathbf{C} - 0_{\mathbf{C}}) \times S$.

However, by the definition of $\sigma^{\mathfrak{U}}$, the *map* $(\mathbf{C} - 0_{\mathbf{C}}) \times S \to \mathrm{Gr}_{SL_n, \mathbf{X}} \to \mathcal{G}_{SL_n}$ is the constant map corresponding to the trivial bundle. Therefore, the trivialization does extend.

6. Properties of Uhlenbeck spaces

6.1. Let $\phi : G_1 \to G_2$ be a homomorphism of simple simply connected groups, and let $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ denote the corresponding homomorphism $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathbb{Z} \simeq H_3(G_1, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_3(G_2, \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$. Observe that for a curve $\mathbf{X}$, the pull-back of the canonical line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{G_2}(\mathbf{X})}$ under the induced map $\mathrm{Bun}_{G_1}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_{G_2}(\mathbf{X})$, is $\mathcal{P}^{\otimes \phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(1)}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{G_1}(\mathbf{X})}$. In particular, the map $\mathrm{Bun}_{G_1}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{Bun}_{G_2}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ sends $\mathrm{Bun}^a_{G_1}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ to $\mathrm{Bun}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$.

Lemma 6.2. *The map* $\mathrm{Bun}^a_{G_1}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \mathrm{Bun}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ *extends to morphisms* $\mathfrak{U}^a_{G_1} \to \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2}$ *and* $''\mathfrak{U}^a_{G_1} \to ''\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2}$. *When* ϕ *is injective, both these maps are closed embeddings.*

Proof. First, for a curve $\mathbf{X}$, from $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)$ we obtain a map $\mathbf{X}^{(a)} \to \mathbf{X}^{(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a))}$, and the corresponding map $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G_1,\mathbf{X}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2,\mathbf{X}}$. The last morphism is closed embedding if ϕ is.

Hence, according to Proposition 1.12(c), for a curve $\mathbf{C}$ with a marked point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$ we obtain a morphism of the corresponding based quasi-maps spaces:

$$\phi_{\mathrm{QMaps}} : \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G_1,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2,\mathbf{X}}).$$

The existence of the maps $\mathfrak{U}^a_{G_1} \to \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2}$ and $''\mathfrak{U}^a_{G_1} \to ''\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{G_2}$ follows now from the definition of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ and $''\mathfrak{U}^a_G$. .

□

6.3. **Comparison of the definitions: the general case.** The above lemma allows us to establish the equivalence of the two definitions of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$:

Proof. (of Theorem 4.8)

Let us choose a faithful representation $\phi : G \to SL_n$. By the previous lemma, $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ and $''\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ are isomorphic to the closures of $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ in $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ and $''\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, respectively.

However, by Theorem 5.12, the map $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to ''\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ is an isomorphism. Hence, $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to ''\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is an isomorphism as well.

□

6.4. **Factorization property.** Next, we will establish the factorization property of Uhlenbeck compactifications. Let us fix a pair of non-parallel lines $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, and consider the corresponding projection $\varpi^a_h : \mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$.

Proposition 6.5. *For* $a = a_1 + a_2$, *there is a natural isomorphism*

$$(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G \simeq (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_G \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_G).$$

To prove this proposition, we will first consider the case of SL_n:

Proposition 6.6. *For* $a = a_1 + a_2$ *there are natural isomorphisms:*

$$(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n \simeq (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{a_1}_n \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^{a_2}_n),$$

$$(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} \mathfrak{N}^a_n \simeq (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\mathfrak{N}^{a_1}_n \times \mathfrak{N}^{a_2}_n).$$

Proof. The second factorization isomorphism follows from the first one since $\mathfrak{N}^a_n$ is the affinization of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$.

Let $\mathsf{Coh}_n(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}})$ be the stack of coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{X}$ with a trivialization at $\infty_{\mathbf{X}}$. This is a smooth stack, which contains an open subset isomorphic to the point scheme, that corresponds to the trivial rank-n vector bundle. The complement to this open subset is of codimension 1, and hence is a Cartier divisor.

Observe now that the scheme $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$ represents the functor of maps, $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}, \mathsf{Coh}_n(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}}))$, where the latter is as in Sect. 2.16.

Indeed, an S-point of $\mathrm{Maps}^a(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}, \mathsf{Coh}_n(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}}))$, is according to Lemma 2.14 the same as coherent sheaf $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{C} \times S$, trivialized over $\infty_{\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{C} \times S$ and $\mathbf{X} \times \infty_{\mathbf{C}} \times S$, and which is $\mathbf{C} \times S$-flat. But this implies that for every geometric point $s \in S$, the restriction $\mathcal{M}|_{\mathbf{S} \times s}$ is torsion free.

Hence, the assertion about the factorization of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$ follows from Proposition 2.17.

□

Now we can prove Proposition 6.5:

Proof. Let us choose a faithful representation $\phi : G \to SL_n$ and consider the corresponding closed embedding

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n.$$

The image of this map lies in the closed subscheme

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a))}}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n \simeq \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a))}}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n).$$

Now, $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$ factorizes over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$ according to Proposition 2.19, and the fiber product $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a))}}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$ factorizes over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$ because $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$ does so over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a))}$. This implies the proposition in view of isomorphism (10).

□

6.7. Let us fix a point $\mathbf{d}_v \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$ and observe that the curve $\mathbf{C}$ is well-defined without the additional choice of $\mathbf{d}_h \in \mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_v$. Indeed, $\mathbf{C}$ is canonically identified with the projectivization of the tangent space $T\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}_v}$. Thus, the map $\varpi^a_{h,\mathsf{O}}$ gives rise to a map

$$\varpi^a_{h,\mathbf{d}_v} : (\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_v) \times \mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}.$$

Proposition 6.8. *The above map $\varpi^a_{h,\mathbf{d}_v}$ is independent of the variable $\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_v$. Moreover, the corresponding factorization isomorphisms of Proposition 6.5 are also independent of the choice of $\mathbf{d}_h$.*

Proof. Since $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ is dense in $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, it is enough to show that the corresponding map $(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_v) \times \mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$ is independent of the first $\mathbf{d}_h$, and similarly for the factorization isomorphisms.

Consider the surface $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{d}_v}$ obtained by blowing up $\mathbf{S}$ at $\mathbf{d}_v$. Then the exceptional divisor identifies canonically with $\mathbf{C}$, and we have a projection $\pi^{\mathbf{d}_v}_v : \mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{d}_v} \to \mathbf{C}$. We can consider the corresponding stack $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}_v}, \mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{d}_v}_\infty)$, which classifies G-bundles with a trivialization along $\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{d}_v}_\infty := \big(\mathbf{C} \cup (\pi^{\mathbf{d}_v}_v)^{-1}(\infty_{\mathbf{C}})\big) \subset \mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{d}_v}$.

In addition, $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{d}_v}$ can be regarded as a relative curve $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{C}}$ with a marked infinity over $\mathbf{C}$, and we can consider the relative stack $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{C}}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{C}}})$. This stack contains an open substack (corresponding to the trivial bundle) and its complement is a Cartier divisor.

The corresponding space of sections $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X}_\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}_\mathbf{C}})$ identifies with $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}_v}, \mathbf{D}_\infty^{\mathbf{d}_v})$, and thus gives rise to a map

$$\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{d}_v}, \mathbf{D}_\infty^{\mathbf{d}_v}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)},$$

and the corresponding factorization isomorphisms, cf. Proposition 2.17. This makes the assertion of the proposition manifest.

□

6.9. Let us fix now a point $\mathbf{d}_h \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$, and consider the family of curves $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h}$ corresponding to the moving point $\mathbf{d}_v \in \mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h$.

We have a natural forgetful map

$$\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h}),$$

and by composing with $\varpi^a_{h,\mathsf{O}}$ we obtain a map

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h}).$$

From Proposition 6.8 we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 6.10. *The map*

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h})$$

is a closed embedding, where $\mathbf{C}$ *corresponds to some fixed point of* $\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h$.

Proof. We know that $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}})$ is a closed embedding, and if we consider the open subset $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}} := \mathsf{O} - \mathbf{d}_h \times (\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h)$, the map

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Maps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}(\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}}})$$

would be a closed embedding as well. However, from Proposition 6.8, we obtain that the map $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}}})$ factors as

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h}) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}}}),$$

where the last arrow comes from the projection on the first factor $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{O}} \to (\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h)$.

This establishes the proposition. □

7. Stratifications and IC stalks

7.1. In this section we will introduce a stratification of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ and formulate a theorem describing the intersection cohomology sheaf $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}$.

Let b be an integer $0 \leq b \leq a$, and set by definition $\mathfrak{U}^{a;b}_G := \mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$.

Theorem 7.2. *There exists a canonical locally closed embedding* $\iota_b : \mathfrak{U}^{a;b}_G \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G$. *Moreover,* $\mathfrak{U}^a_G = \bigcup_b \mathfrak{U}^{a;b}_G$.

7.3. **Proof of Theorem 7.2.** Let $(\mathcal{F}'_G, D_{\mathbf{S}})$ be a point of $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$. For every pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, the data of $\mathcal{F}'_G$ defines a based *map* $\sigma' : \mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a-b}$ of degree $a-b$.

Consider the embedding $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a-b} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$ obtained by adding to the divisor $D_v \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a-b)}$ the divisor $\pi_h(D_{\mathbf{S}})$. We define the sought-for quasi-map $\sigma : \mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$ by adding to the map

$$\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\sigma'} \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a-b} \to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a} \tag{16}$$

the defect equal to $\pi_v(D_{\mathbf{S}})$, cf. Sect. 1.16 and Sect. 2.3 (3). Since this can be done for any pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, we obtain a point of $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})$. This morphism is a locally closed embedding due to the corresponding property of the quasi-maps' spaces.

Note that the above construction defines in fact a map $\bar{\iota}_b : \mathfrak{U}_G^{a-b} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})$.

Now our goal is to prove that the image of ι_b belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, and that every geometric point of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ belongs to (exactly) one of the subschemes $\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;b}$. First, we shall do that for $G = SL_n$.

Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^{a;b}$ be the scheme classifying pairs $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}'$, where $\mathcal{M} \in \mathfrak{N}_n^a$, and $\mathcal{M}'$ is a vector bundle on $\mathbf{S}$, such that $\mathcal{M}'/\mathcal{M}$ is a torsion sheaf of length b. We have a natural proper and surjective map

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^{a;b} \to \mathrm{Bun}_n^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}),$$

and a locally-closed embedding $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^{a;b} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a$. Moreover, it is easy to see that the square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^{a;b} & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Bun}_n^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) & \xrightarrow{\iota_b} & \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}}) \end{array} \tag{17}$$

is commutative, where in the above diagram the right vertical arrow is the composition of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a \to \mathfrak{N}_n^a \simeq \mathfrak{U}_n^a$ and $\mathfrak{U}_n^a \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})$.

This readily shows that the image of ι_b belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ for $G = SL_n$. Moreover, since $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^a \simeq \underset{b}{\cup} \widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}_n^{a;b}$, we obtain that $\mathfrak{U}_n^a \simeq \underset{b}{\cup} \mathfrak{U}_n^{a;b}$.

Now let us treat the case of an arbitrary G. To show that the image of ι_b belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ consider the open subset in the product $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ corresponding to pairs $(\mathcal{F}_G, D_{\mathbf{S}})$ such that $\pi_v(D_{\mathbf{S}})$ is a multiplicity-free divisor, disjoint from $\varpi_h^{a-b}(\mathcal{F}_G)$. It would be enough to show that the image of this open subset in $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a})_{\mathsf{O}})$ is contained in $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$.

Note, that from Equation (17) we obtain the following compatibility relation of the map ι_b with the factorization isomorphisms of Proposition 6.5 for SL_n. For $b = b_1 + b_2$ the map

$$\begin{array}{c} (\mathrm{Bun}_n^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)} \right)_{disj} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota_b} \\ \mathfrak{U}_n^a \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)} \right)_{disj} \end{array}$$

coincides with the composition

$$\begin{array}{c}
(\mathrm{Bun}_n^{a-b}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)\times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}))\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times}\left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)}\right)_{disj}\\
\sim\big\downarrow\\
(\mathrm{Bun}_n^{a-b}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)\times \mathrm{Sym}^{b_1}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})\times \mathrm{Sym}^{b_2}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}))\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)}}{\times}\left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)}\right)_{disj}\\
\mathrm{id}\times\iota_{b_1}\times\iota_{b_2}\big\downarrow\\
(\mathfrak{U}_n^{a-b}\times\mathfrak{U}_n^{b_1}\times\mathfrak{U}_n^{b_2})\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)}}{\times}\left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)}\right)_{disj}\\
\sim\big\downarrow\\
\mathfrak{U}_n^a\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}}{\times}\left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a-b)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b_2)}\right)_{disj}.
\end{array}$$

Hence, by embedding G into SL_n and using Lemma 6.2, we reduce our assertion to the case when $b=a=1$. Using the action of the group of affine-linear transformations, we reduce the assertion further to the fact that the image of the point-scheme, thought of as $\mathrm{Bun}_G^0(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)\times 0_{\mathbf{S}}$, belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_G^1$.

However, as in the proof of Theorem 5.12, the above point-scheme is the only attractor of the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$. In particular, it is contained in the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}_G^1(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$, which is $\mathfrak{U}_G^1$.

To finish the proof of the theorem, we have to show that every geometric point of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ belongs to (exactly) one of the subschemes $\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;b}$. That these subschemes are mutually disjoint is clear from the fact that b can be recovered as a total defect of a quasi-map.

Let σ_{O} be a point of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, thought of as a collection of quasi-maps $\sigma:\mathbf{C}\to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$ for every pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$. We have to show that there exists a point $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O}}\in \mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$, and a 0-cycle $D_{\mathbf{S}}=\Sigma b_i\cdot \mathbf{s}_i$ on $\mathbf{S}$, such that for every pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$, the corresponding quasi-map $\sigma:\mathbf{C}\to \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a}$ has as its saturation the composition

$$\mathbf{C}\xrightarrow{\sigma'}\mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a-b}\hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X}}^{BD,a},$$

(the last arrow is as in (16)), with defect $\pi_v(D_{\mathbf{S}})$. (In what follows we will say that the point $\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}\in\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ has saturation equal to the G-bundle $\mathcal{F}'_G$ corresponding to σ'_{O}, and the defect given by the 0-cycle $D_{\mathbf{S}}$.)

For a faithful representation $\phi:G\to SL_n$, let $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},n}$ be the corresponding point of $\mathfrak{U}_n^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}$. We know that $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},n}$ can be described as a pair $(\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},n},D_{\mathbf{S},n})$, where $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},n}$ is the saturation of $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},n}$, i.e. a point of $\mathrm{Bun}_n^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a-b)}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$, and $D_{\mathbf{S},n}=\Sigma\, b_{i,n}\cdot\mathbf{s}_i$ is a 0-cycle on $\mathbf{S}$.

For a fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$, let σ'' be the saturation of σ. In particular, σ'' defines a G-bundle on $\mathbf{S}$, with a trivialization along $\mathbf{D}_\infty$, such that the induced SL_n-bundle is isomorphic to $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},n}$. Since the morphism $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)\to\mathrm{Bun}_n(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$ is an embedding, we obtain that this G-bundle on $\mathbf{S}$ is well-defined, i.e., is independent of $(\mathbf{d}_v,\mathbf{d}_h)$. We set σ'_{O} to be the corresponding point of $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty)$.

It remains to show that the integers $b_{i,n}$ are divisible by $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(1)$. For that we choose a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, so that the points $\pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$ are pairwise distinct. Then the corresponding b_i's are reconstructed as the defect of the quasi-map σ.

This completes the proof of the theorem.

7.4. Note that in the course of the proof of Theorem 7.2 we have established that the morphisms $\overline{\imath} : \mathfrak{U}_G^{a-b} \times \mathrm{Sym}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathfrak{U}_G^a$ are compatible in a natural sense with the factorization isomorphisms of Proposition 6.5. This is so because the corresponding property is true for SL_n.

As a corollary of Theorem 7.2, we obtain, in particular, the following:

Corollary 7.5. *The variety* $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ *is quasi-affine, and its affine closure is isomorphic to the normalization of* $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$.

Proof. Indeed, we know that $\dim \mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) = 2 \cdot \check{h} \cdot a$ and from Theorem 7.2, we obtain that the complement to $\mathrm{Bun}_G^a(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ inside the normalization of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ is of dimension $2 \cdot \check{h} \cdot (a-1) + 2$. I.e., it is of codimension $2(\check{h} - 1) \geq 2$.

□

We do not know whether $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ is in general a normal variety, but this is true for $G = SL_n$ since $\mathfrak{U}_n^a \simeq \mathfrak{N}_n^a$, cf. [CB].

7.6. For a fixed pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$ and a point $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$, consider the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathbf{S}$, which acts as identity on $\mathbf{C}$ and by dilations on $\mathbf{X}$, fixing $0_{\mathbf{X}}$. By transport of structure, we obtain a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$.

Proposition 7.7. *The above* $\mathbb{G}_m$*-action on* $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ *contracts this space to*

$$(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a)} \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}{}^{(a)} \simeq \mathfrak{U}_G^{a;a} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_G^a.$$

The contraction map $\mathfrak{U}_G^a \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$ *coincides with* ϖ_h^a.

Proof. We will use the description of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ via Corollary 6.10, i.e. we realize it as a closed subset in

$$\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h}).$$

Note that the family of curves $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h}$ can be naturally identified with the constant family $(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h) \times \mathbf{C}$ via the projection $\mathbf{C} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}} \overset{\pi_v}{\to} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{d}_v}$ for each $\mathbf{d}_v \in \mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h$. In terms of this trivialization, the above $\mathbb{G}_m$-action contracts the space $\mathrm{Sect}(\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h})$ to the space of constant sections, which can be identified with $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}$.

In addition, from Proposition 2.6 we obtain that the above $\mathbb{G}_m$-action contracts the space $\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$ to $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)} \subset \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})$.

By comparing it with our description of the map $i_b : \mathfrak{U}_G^{a;b} \to \mathfrak{U}_G^a$ for $b = a$ we obtain the assertion of the proposition.

□

7.8. **An example.** Let us describe explicitly the Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ for $a = 1$. (In particular, using Proposition 6.5, this will imply the description of the singularities of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ for general a along the strata $\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;b}$ for $b = 1$.)

Choose a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, and consider the corresponding surface $\mathbf{S}' = \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X}$. Let us choose points $0_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{C} - \infty_{\mathbf{C}}$, $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X} - \infty_{\mathbf{X}}$, and consider the affine Grassmannian

$\mathrm{Gr}_G := \mathrm{Gr}_{G,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}}$. Let $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G \subset \mathrm{Gr}_G$ be the corresponding closed subscheme. It contains the unit point $\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Gr}} \in \mathrm{Gr}_G$, which is its only singularity.

By definition, we have a map $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X})$, and, as we know, the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X})$ carries a line bubdle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{X})}$ with a section, whose set of zeroes is the locus of non-trivial bundles. Let us denote by $D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G}$ the corresponding Cartier divisor in $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G$. Note that the point $\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Gr}}$ belongs to $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G}$.

We claim that there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{U}^1_G \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} \times (\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G}).$$

We have the projection

$$\varpi^1_h \times \varpi^1_v : \mathfrak{U}^1_G \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}},$$

and the group $\mathbb{A}^2$ acts on $\mathfrak{U}^1_G$ via its action on $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ by shifts. Therefore, it is enough to show that

$$(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X}) \simeq \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G}. \tag{18}$$

Note that the intersection $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X})$ contains only one geometric point, which is not in $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$, namely, the point $0_\mathbf{C} \times 0_\mathbf{X}$ from the stratum $\mathfrak{U}^{1;1}_G$.

Let $\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{C} \in \mathbf{C}$ be a point different from $0_\mathbf{C}$ and $\infty_\mathbf{C}$. Given a point in $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X})$, we have a quasi-map $\sigma : \mathbf{C} \to \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G$ (cf. Sect. 3.8), such that σ, restricted to $\mathbf{C} - 0_\mathbf{C}$, is a *map*, whose image belongs to $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G}$. Hence, $\sigma \mapsto \sigma(\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{C})$ defines a map in one direction $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X}) \to (\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G})$.

Let us show first that this map is one-to-one. From the proof of Theorem 7.2, it is clear that it sends the unique point in $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X}) \cap \mathfrak{U}^{1;1}_G$ to the point $\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Gr}} \in \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G}$.

Now, let σ_1, σ_2 be two elements of $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X})$. Since both σ_1 and σ_2 are of degree 1, if we had $\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Gr}} = \sigma_1(\infty_\mathbf{C}) = \sigma_2(\infty_\mathbf{C})$, and $\sigma_1(\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{C}) = \sigma_2(\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{C})$, this would imply $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$. For the same reason, no *map* σ can send $\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Gr}}$.

Hence, the map $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X}) \to (\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G})$ is one-to-one on the level of geometric points. Since the left-hand side is reduced, and the right-hand side is normal, we obtain that it is an open embedding. Recall now the action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ by dilations along the $\mathbf{X}$-factor. We claim that it contracts $(\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G})$ to the point $\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Gr}}$. Indeed, we have a closed emedding $\mathrm{Gr}_G \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$, such that $(\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G})$ gets mapped to the corresponding open cell $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{g}^+_{aff},e}$, cf. Sect. 2.2, and for Schubert cells the contraction assertion is evident.

Using Proposition 7.7, this implies that $(\varpi^1_h)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{C}) \cap (\varpi^1_v)^{-1}(0_\mathbf{X}) \to (\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G})$ is in fact an isomorphism.

Remark. It is well-known that $(\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G - D_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}{}^{\overline{\alpha}_0}_G})$ is isomorphic to the minimal nilpotent orbit closure $\overline{\mathbb{O}}_{\min}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$. It was noticed by V. Drinfeld in 1998 that the transversal slice to the singularity of $\mathfrak{U}^1_G$ should look like $\overline{\mathbb{O}}_{\min}$.

7.9. For a fixed b, $0 \leq b \leq a$, let $\mathfrak{P}(b)$ be its partition, i.e. $b = \sum_k n_k \cdot d_k$, with $d_k > 0$ and pairwise distinct. Let us denote by $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ the variety $\prod_k \mathrm{Sym}^{n_k}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$, and by $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ the open subset of $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ obtained by removing all the diagonals.

The symmetric power $\mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ is the union $\underset{\mathfrak{P}(b)}{\cup} \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ over all the partitions of b. Let $\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;\mathfrak{P}(b)} = \mathrm{Bun}_G^{a-b}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ be the corresponding subscheme in $\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;\mathfrak{P}(b)}$.

The next theorem, which can be regarded as the main result of this paper, describes the restriction of the intersection cohomology sheaf of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ to the strata $\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;\mathfrak{P}}$.

Let $\check{\mathfrak{g}}_{aff}$ denote the Langlands dual Lie algebra to $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$. Consider the (maximal) parabolic $\mathfrak{g}[[t]] \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C} \oplus d \cdot \mathbb{C} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{aff}$; then we obtain the corresponding parabolic inside $\check{\mathfrak{g}}_{aff}$, whose unipotent radical $\mathfrak{V}$ is an (integrable) module over the corresponding dual Levi subalgebra, i.e. $\mathfrak{V}$ is a representation of the group $\check{G}_{aff} = \check{G} \times \mathbb{G}_m$. In particular, we can consider the space $\mathfrak{V}^f$, where $f \in \check{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a principal nilpotent element. We regard $\mathfrak{V}^f$ as a bi-graded vector space, $\mathfrak{V}^f = \underset{m,l}{\oplus} (\mathfrak{V}^f)_l^m$: where the "first" grading, corresponding to the upper index m, is the principal grading coming from the Jacobson-Morozov triple containing f, and the "second" grading, corresponding to the lower index l, comes from the action of $\mathbb{G}_m \subset G_{aff}$.

For a partition $\mathfrak{P}(b)$ as above, we will denote by $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\mathfrak{V}^f)$ the graded vector space

$$\bigotimes_k \left(\underset{i \geq 0}{\oplus} \left(\mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{V}^f) \right)_{d_k} [2i] \right)^{\otimes n_k},$$

where the subscript d_k means that we are taking the graded subspace of the corresponding index with respect to the "second" grading, and the notation $[j]$ means the shift with respect to the "first" grading. By declaring the "first" grading to be cohomological we obtain a semi-simple complex of vector spaces.

Theorem 7.10. *The restriction* $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}_G^a} \big|_{\mathfrak{U}_G^{a;\mathfrak{P}(b)}}$ *is locally constant and is isomorphic to the IC sheaf on this scheme tensored by the (constant) complex* $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\mathfrak{V}^f)$.

8. Functorial definitions

8.1. An obvious disadvantage of our definition of $\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ is that we were not able to say what functor it represents. In this section, we will give two more variants of the definition of the Uhlenbeck space, we will call them ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ and ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}_G^a$, respectively, and which will be defined as functors. Moreover, ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ will be a scheme, whereas ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}_G^a$ only an ind-scheme.

We will have a sequence of closed embeddings

$$\mathfrak{U}_G^a \to {}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}_G^a \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}_G^a,$$

which induce isomorphisms on the level of the corresponding reduced schemes. (In other words, up to nilpotents, one can give a functorial definition of the Uhlenbeck space.)

8.2. **A Tannakian definition.** In this subsection, we will express the Uhlenbeck space for an arbitrary G in terms of that of SL_n.

For two integers n_1 and n_2 consider the homomorphisms

$$SL_{n_1} \times SL_{n_2} \to SL_{n_1+n_2} \text{ and } SL_{n_1} \times SL_{n_2} \to SL_{n_1 \cdot n_2},$$

and the corresponding morphisms

$$\mathrm{Bun}_{n_1}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathrm{Bun}_{n_2}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbf{X}) \text{ and } \mathrm{Bun}_{n_1}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathrm{Bun}_{n_2}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_{n_1 \cdot n_2}(\mathbf{X}).$$

Note that the pull-backs of the line bundles $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbf{X})}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{n_1 \cdot n_2}(\mathbf{X})}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{n_1}(\mathbf{X})} \boxtimes \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{n_2}(\mathbf{X})}$ and $\mathcal{P}^{\otimes n_2}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{n_1}(\mathbf{X})} \boxtimes \mathcal{P}^{\otimes n_1}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{n_2}(\mathbf{X})}$, respectively.

As in Lemma 6.2, we obtain the closed embeddings $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{n_2} \to \mathfrak{U}^{a_1+a_2}_{n_1+n_2}$ and $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{n_2} \to \mathfrak{U}^{a_1 \cdot n_2 + a_2 \cdot n_1}_{n_1 \cdot n_2}$, which extend the natural morphisms between the corresponding moduli spaces $\mathrm{Bun}^a_n(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$.

Moreover, it is easy to deduce from the proof of Theorem 7.2 that if $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},1}$ (resp., $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},2}$) is a collection of based quasi-maps $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{SL_{n_1},\mathbf{X}}$ describing a point of $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1}$, whose saturation is $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},1}$ and defect $D_{1,\mathbf{S}}$ (resp., $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},2}$, $D_{2,\mathbf{S}}$), then the corresponding point of $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1+a_2}_{n_1+n_2}$ (resp., $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1 \cdot n_2 + a_2 \cdot n_1}_{n_1 \cdot n_2}$) will have the saturation $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},1} \oplus \sigma'_{\mathsf{O},2}$ (resp., $\sigma'_{\mathsf{O},1} \otimes \sigma'_{\mathsf{O},2}$) and defect $D_{1,\mathbf{S}} + D_{2,\mathbf{S}}$ (resp., $n_2 \cdot D_{1,\mathbf{S}} + n_1 \cdot D_{2,\mathbf{S}}$).

8.3. We set ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ to represent the functor that assigns to a test scheme S the following data:

- An S-point of Sect $\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big)$,
- For every representation $\phi : G \to SL_n$, a point of $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$,

such that

- The corresponding S-points of Sect $\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big)$, coming from

  $$\text{Sect}\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big) \to \text{Sect}\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big) \leftarrow \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$$

  coincide,
- For $\phi = \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2$, $n = n_1 \cdot n_2$ (resp., $\phi = \phi_1 \oplus \phi_2$, $n = n_1 + n_2$), the corresponding S-point of $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$ equals the image of the corresponding point of $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{1\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{2\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{n_2}$ under

  $$\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{1\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{2\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{n_2} \to \mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n.$$

Since for a faithful representation $\phi : G \to SL_n$, the map Sect $\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big) \to$ Sect $\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_{SL_n,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big)$ is a closed embedding, it is easy to see that ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is in fact a closed subfunctor in $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$; in particular, ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is indeed representable by an affine scheme of finite type. Moreover, by construction, we have a closed embedding $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

Proposition 8.4. *The above map $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ induces an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes.*

We do not know whether it is in general true that ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is actually isomorphic to $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

Proof. Since the map in question is a closed embedding, we only have to check that it defines a surjection on the level of geometric points.

Thus, let $\sigma_{\mathsf{O}} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ be the collection of quasi-maps representing a point of Sect $\Big(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}}\Big)$, and $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},\phi}$ be a compatible system of points of $\mathfrak{U}^{\phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(a)}_n$ for every representation $\phi : G \to SL_n$.

Using Theorem 7.2, we have to show that there exists a point $\mathcal{F}'_G \in \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ (corresponding to a system of maps σ'_{O}) and a 0-cycle $D_{\mathbf{S}}$, such that for every $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$, the corresponding quasi-map σ has as its saturation the map of (16) and $\pi_v(D_{\mathbf{S}})$ as its defect.

Let $\mathcal{F}'_\phi$ be the SL_n bundle corresponding to the saturation of $\sigma_{\mathsf{O},\phi}$. From our description of the maps $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{n_2} \to \mathfrak{U}^{a_1+a_2}_{n_1+n_2}$ and $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{n_2} \to \mathfrak{U}^{a_1\cdot n_2+a_2\cdot n_1}_{n_1\cdot n_2}$ it follows that $\mathcal{F}'_{\phi_1\oplus\phi_2} \simeq \mathcal{F}'_{\phi_1} \oplus \mathcal{F}'_{\phi_2}$ and $\mathcal{F}'_{\phi_1\otimes\phi_2} \simeq \mathcal{F}'_{\phi_1} \otimes \mathcal{F}'_{\phi_2}$.

Therefore, the collection $\{\mathcal{F}'_\phi\}$ defines a G-bundle on $\mathbf{S}$, trivialized along $\mathbf{D}_\infty$, which we set to be our $\mathcal{F}'_G$. The 0-cycle $D_{\mathbf{S}}$ is reconstructed using just one faithful representation of G, as in the proof of Theorem 7.2.

□

8.5. **Drinfeld's approach.** Consider the following functor { Schemes of finite type } → { Groupoids }; we will call it ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, since the definition below follows a suggestion of Drinfeld. The category corresponding to a test scheme S has as objects the data of:

- A principal G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ defined on an open subscheme of $U \subset \mathbf{S} \times S$, such that $\mathbf{S} \times S - U$ is finite over S, and $U \supset \mathbf{D}_\infty \times S$, and $\mathcal{F}_G$ is equipped with a trivialization along $\mathbf{D}_\infty \times S$. (We will denote by U_{O} the corresponding open subset in $\mathbf{S}'_{\mathsf{O}} \times S$, and by $\mathcal{F}_{G,\mathsf{O}}$ the corresponding G-bundle over it.)
- A map $S \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})^\tau$. (This expression makes use of the superscript τ, which was introduced in Lemma 4.10.) We will denote by σ_{O} the corresponding relative quasi-map $\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}} \times S \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}}$. Let $V_{\mathsf{O}} \subset \mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}} \times S$ denote the open subset over which σ_{O} is defined as a map, and $D_{v,\mathsf{O}} \subset \mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}} \times S$ the corresponding relative divisor. Let $U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}} \subset \mathbf{S}'_{\mathsf{O}} \times S$ be the open subset $V_{\mathsf{O}} \underset{\mathsf{O}}{\times} \mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}} \cup \mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}} \underset{\mathsf{O}}{\times} (\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}} - D_{v,\mathsf{O}})$, and $\mathcal{F}^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}_G$ be the corresponding principal G-bundle defined on $U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}$.
- An isomorphism α between $\mathcal{F}_{G,\mathsf{O}}|_{U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}} \cap U_{\mathsf{O}}}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}_G|_{U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}} \cap U_{\mathsf{O}}}$, respecting the trivializations along $\mathbf{D}'_{\infty,\mathsf{O}} \times S$.

Morphisms between an object $(\mathcal{F}_G, U, \sigma_{\mathsf{O}}, \alpha)$ and another object $(\mathcal{F}^1_G, U^1, \sigma^1_{\mathsf{O}}, \alpha^1)$ are G-bundles isomorphisms $\mathcal{F}_G \simeq \mathcal{F}^1_G|_{U^1_{\mathsf{O}} \cap U_{\mathsf{O}}}$, which commute with other pieces of data (in particular, the data of σ_{O} must be the same). In particular, we see that objects in our category have no non-trivial automorphisms, i.e. ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is a functor { Schemes of finite type } → { Sets }.

Lemma 8.6. *The functor ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is representable by an affine ind-scheme of ind-finite type.*

(Later we will show that ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$ is in fact a closed embedding.)

Proof. It is enough to show that the forgetful map ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$ is ind-representable (and ind-affine). Thus, for a test-scheme S let σ_{O} be a relative quasi-map $\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}} \times S \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}}$, and let $U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}$, $\mathcal{F}^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}_G$ be as above.

Let $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$ be some fixed pair of directions, and set $U \subset \mathbf{S}' \times S$ (resp., $\mathcal{F}_G$) to be the fiber of $U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}$ (resp., $\mathcal{F}^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}_G$) over the corresponding point of O. We will denote by the same character U (resp., $\mathcal{F}_G$) the corresponding open subset in $\mathbf{S} \times S$ (resp., the G-bundle over it).

Consider the group ind-scheme over S, call it $\mathrm{Aut}_U(\mathcal{F}_G)$, of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}_G$, respecting the trivialization at the divisor of infinity. Consider now the group ind-scheme of S-maps $S \times \mathsf{O} \to \mathrm{Aut}_U(\mathcal{F}_G)$. Then it is easy to see that the fiber product

$$S \underset{\mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O},\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^a_G)_{\mathsf{O}})}{\times} {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$$

is (ind)-represented by the above ind-scheme $\mathrm{Maps}_S(S \times \mathsf{O}, \mathrm{Aut}_U(\mathcal{F}_G))$.

□

The rest of this section will be devoted to the proof of the following result:

Theorem 8.7. *We have a closed embedding ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, which induces an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes.*

8.8. Our first task is to construct the map ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$. The first case to consider is $G = SL_n$. In this case, by the definition of ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, we have $\mathfrak{U}^a_n \simeq^{Tann} \mathfrak{U}^a_n$.

Since ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_n$ is ind-affine, and $\mathfrak{U}^a_n \simeq \mathfrak{N}^a_n$ is the affinization of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$, to construct a map $\mathfrak{U}^a_n \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_n$, it suffices to construct a map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

Given an S-point $\mathcal{M}$ of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$, i.e. an S-family of torsion-free sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$, there exists an open subset $U \subset \mathbf{S} \times S$ whose complement is finite over S, such that $\mathcal{M}$ is a vector bundle when restricted to U, i.e. we obtain a principal SL_n-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{SL_n}$ on U.

The data of a relative quasi-map σ_{O} are obtained from the composition

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^a_G)_{\mathsf{O}}).$$

The isomorphisms $\alpha : \mathcal{F}_{SL_n,\mathsf{O}}|_{U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}} \cap U_{\mathsf{O}}} \simeq \mathcal{F}^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}}_{SL_n}|_{U^{\sigma_{\mathsf{O}}} \cap U_{\mathsf{O}}}$ follow from the construction of the map (14).

Thus, we have a morphism $\mathfrak{U}^a_n \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_n$, and moreover, for $n = n_1 + n_2$ (resp., $n = n_1 \cdot n_2$) and $a = a_1 + a_2$ (resp., $a = n_1 \cdot a_2 + n_2 \cdot a_1$), the natural morphism

$${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1} \times {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{n_2} \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_n$$

is compatible with the corresponding morphism $\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{n_1} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{n_2} \to \mathfrak{U}^a_n$. Hence, we have the morphism ${}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ for an arbitrary G.

Next, we will show that the composition $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Tann}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is a closed embedding. Let $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}^a_G$ be the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ in ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

Then under the projection ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$, $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}^a_G$ gets mapped to $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, and we obtain a pair of arrows

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \leftrightarrows \overline{\mathfrak{U}}^a_G,$$

such that both compositions induce the identity map on $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$. Since the latter is dense, we obtain that the map $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \overline{\mathfrak{U}}^a_G$ is in fact an isomorphism.

Thus, $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is a closed embedding, and let us show now that it induces an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ to the reduced (ind)-scheme underlying ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$. For that we have to check that this map is surjective on the level of geometric points.

Let $(\mathcal{F}_G, \sigma_{\mathsf{O}}, \alpha)$ is a geometric point of ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, and let $D_{v,\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $D_{h,\mathsf{O}}$) be the relative Cartier divisors in $\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}}$) obtained from σ_{O} via $\varpi^a_{v,\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $\varpi^a_{h,\mathsf{O}}$). Let us denote by $\mathcal{F}'_G$ the (unique) extension of $\mathcal{F}_G$ to the entire $\mathbf{S}$. Let σ'_{O} be the map $\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}} \times S \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a-b}_{G,\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{F}'_G$. Let $D'_{v,\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $D'_{h,\mathsf{O}}$) be the relative divisors in $\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}$ (resp., $\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}}$) corresponding to σ'_{O}.

Set $\mathbf{S} - U = \bigcup_i \mathbf{s}_i$. Our task is to show that there exist integers b_i such that for every pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathsf{O}$, we have:

(1) $D_v = D'_v + b_i \cdot \pi_h(\mathbf{s}_i)$, $D_h = D'_h + b_i \cdot \pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$

(2) The quasi-map σ has the saturation equal to $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\sigma'} \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a-b}_{G,\mathbf{X},D'_v} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D_v}$,

(3) The defect of σ equals $\sum_i b_i \cdot \pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$.

Let $\sigma'' : \mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D_v}$ be a based map of degree $a - b$, which is the saturation of σ. We know that σ is obtained from σ'' by adding to it a divisor of degree b supported on $\bigcup_i \pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$.

Hence, by letting $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$ move along O, we obtain a section $\mathsf{O} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(b)}_{\mathsf{O}}$ with the above support property. However, it is easy to see that any such section is of the form

$$(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \mapsto \sum_i b_i \cdot \pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$$

for some integers b_i.

Now, since the maps σ' and σ'' give rise to the same bundle on $\mathbf{S}'$, the two compositions

$$\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\sigma'} \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a-b}_{G,\mathbf{X},D'_v} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}} \text{ and } \mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\sigma''} \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D_v} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$$

coincide. Hence, σ' and σ'' have the same degree $a-b$ and $\varpi_h^{a-b}(\sigma') = \varpi_h^{a-b}(\sigma'')$. Since, by the property of saturations, cf. (4), we have $\varpi_h^a(\sigma) = \varpi_v^{a-b}(\sigma'') + \sum_i b_i \cdot \pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$, we obtain $D_h = D'_h + b_i \cdot \pi_v(\mathbf{s}_i)$. By combining this with the condition that $\sigma_{\mathsf{O}} \in \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})^\tau$, cf. Lemma 4.10, we obtain also that $D'_v = D_v + \sum_i b_i \cdot \pi_h(\mathbf{s}_i)$. Moreover, we obtain that σ'' is the composition of σ' and the embedding $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a-b}_{G,\mathbf{X},D'_v} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X},D_v}$, which is what we had to show.

To complete the proof of the theorem, it would be enough to show that the projection ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$ is a closed embedding. We know this for the closed subscheme $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, and hence, we obtain a priori that the map in question is ind-finite. Therefore, it would suffice to show that any tangent vector to ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, which is vertical with respect to the map ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \mathrm{Sect}(\mathsf{O}, \mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}})_{\mathsf{O}})$, is in fact zero.

Let $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2) \to {}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ be such a tangent vector. Then the relative quasi-map $\sigma_{\mathsf{O}} : \mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{O}} \times \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2) \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}_{\mathsf{O}}}$ is actually independent of ϵ, and as we have seen in the proof of Lemma 8.6, we can assume that the generically defined G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ is also independent of ϵ. Thus, we are dealing with an infinitesimal automorphism of $\mathcal{F}_G$, and we must show that it is zero.

However, $\mathcal{F}_G$ extends canonically to a G-bundle on the entire $\mathbf{S}$, and so does our infinitesimal automorphism. Since this automorphism preserves the trivialization along $\mathbf{D}_\infty$, our assertion reduces to the fact that points of $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$ have no automorphisms.

Part III: Parabolic versions of Uhlenbeck spaces

Throughout this part, $\mathfrak{g}$ will be a simple finite-dimensional Lie algebra with the corresponding simply-connected group denoted G. By $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$ will denote the corresponding untwisted affine Kac-Moody algebra, i.e. $\mathfrak{g}_{aff} = \mathfrak{g}((x)) \oplus K \cdot \mathbb{C} \oplus d \cdot \mathbb{C}$, as in Sect. 3.7.

9. Parabolic Uhlenbeck spaces

9.1. Let $\mathbb{P}^1 \simeq \mathbf{D}_0 \subset \mathbf{S} \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a divisor different from $\mathbf{D}_\infty$; we will denote by $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{D}}_0$ the intersection $\mathbf{D}_0 \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ the scheme classifying the data consisting of a G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ on $\mathbf{S}$, a trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_G|_{\mathbf{D}_\infty}$, and a reduction to P of $\mathcal{F}_G|_{\mathbf{D}_0}$, compatible with the above trivialization at the point $\mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0$. In other words, if we denote by $\mathrm{Bun}_P(\mathbf{D}_0; \mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0)$ the moduli stack classifying P-bundles on the curve $\mathbf{D}_0$ with a trivialization at $\mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0$, we have an identification

$$\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{D}_0; \mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0)}{\times} \mathrm{Bun}_P(\mathbf{D}_0; \mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0). \tag{19}$$

From this description, we see that $\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ splits into connected components indexed by $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \simeq \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \oplus \delta \cdot \mathbb{Z}$, where for $\theta = (\overline{\theta}, a)$, the index a enumerates the component of $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, and $\overline{\theta}$ that of $\mathrm{Bun}_P(\mathbf{D}_0; \mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0)$.

Recall the scheme $\mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}$, cf. Sect. 3.7, and observe that from Proposition 3.4 it follows that the scheme $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ is isomorphic to the scheme of based maps, $\mathrm{Maps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$. This description implies that $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ is empty unless $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

Our present goal is to introduce parabolic versions of the Uhlenbeck spaces, $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$, both of which contain $\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ as an open subset.

Let us first choose a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h) \in \mathbf{D}_\infty$, but with the condition that $\mathbf{d}_h = \mathbf{D}_\infty \cap \mathbf{D}_0$. I.e., we have a rational surface $\mathbf{S}' \simeq \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X}$, and in addition to $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{C}$ and $\infty_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$, we have a distinguished point $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbf{X}$, such that $\mathbf{D}'_0 = \mathbf{C} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}}$ is the proper transform of $\mathbf{D}_0$. Henceforth, we will identify $\mathbf{D}_0 \simeq \mathbf{D}'_0 \simeq \mathbf{C}$.

We will first introduce $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ using a choice of $\mathbf{d}_v$, and then show that the definition is in fact independent of that choice.

Definition 9.2. *For $\theta = (\overline{\theta}, a)$, the parabolic Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ is defined as the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ in the product $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$.*

Note that for $P = G$, the scheme $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ is nothing but $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

Definition 9.3. *The enhanced parabolic Uhlenbeck space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ is defined as the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ in the product $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$.*

As we shall see later, both $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ are schemes of finite type. Note also that from the definition of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ and Theorem 4.8, it follows that $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ (resp., $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$) could be equivalently defined as the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ inside the product $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}\left(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}\right)$ (resp., $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathrm{Sect}\left(\mathsf{O}, \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}_{\mathsf{O}}\right)$). Note also that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ is a closed subscheme in the product $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta}{\times} \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$ (this is so because the corresponding property holds on the level of quasi-maps' spaces). We will denote the natural projection $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ by $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$. Obviously, for $P = B$, the map $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ is an isomorphism, but it is NOT an isomorphism for $P = G$.

We will denote by $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ and $\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}}$ the natural maps $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$.

The following *horizontal factorization property* of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ follows from the corresponding factorization properties of quasi-maps' spaces (Proposition 2.19) and of the Uhlenbeck space (Proposition 6.5):

Corollary 9.4. *For $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2$, we have canonical isomorphisms*

$$\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2})_{disj} \simeq (\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \mathfrak{U}^{\theta_2}_{G;P}) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2})_{disj}, \text{ and}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2})_{disj} \simeq (\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta_2}_{G;P}) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2})_{disj}.$$

9.5. Now our goal is to prove that the schemes $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ are in fact canonically attached to the surface $\mathbf{S}$ with the divisor $\mathbf{D}_0$, i.e. that they do not depend on the choice of the direction $\mathbf{d}_v$. We will consider the case of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$, since that of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ is analogous (and simpler).

By Theorem 8.7, for $S = \mathfrak{U}^a_G$, the product $\mathbf{S} \times S$ contains an open subset U, such that $\mathbf{S} \times S - U$ is finite over S, and over which we have a well-defined G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$. Let D be a divisor on $\mathbf{C} \times S$, such that $\mathbf{C} \times S - D \subset U$. We set ${}^{Huge}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ to be the ind-scheme of meromorphic enhanced quasi-maps

$$D\cdot\infty\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{F}_G|_{\mathbf{C}\times S-D} \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}),$$

cf. Sect. 2.35 (recall that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is the finite-dimensional flag variety G/P).

Clearly, ${}^{Huge}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$, is defined in a way independent of the choice of $\mathbf{d}_v$. We claim now that for any $\mathbf{d}_v$ we have a closed embedding $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \hookrightarrow {}^{Huge}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$.

Indeed, the scheme $\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$ embeds as a closed subscheme into the corresponding ind-scheme of meromorphic enhanced quasi-maps $D\cdot\infty\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$. Now,

$$D\cdot\infty\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{D\cdot\infty\,\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} S \simeq {}^{Huge}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}.$$

This is because a data of an enhanced quasi-map $(\mathbf{C} \times S - D) \to \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}$, that projects to a given map $(\mathbf{C} \times S - D) \to \mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ is equivalent to a data of an enhanced quasi-map

$$(\mathbf{C} \times S - D) \to \mathcal{F}_G|_{\mathbf{C}\times S-D} \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Note that the composition

$$\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0) \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to {}^{Huge}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$$

is also independent of $\mathbf{d}_v$. This shows that we can identify $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ with the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ inside ${}^{Huge}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$, which makes it manifestly independent of $\mathbf{d}_v$. Note also, that in the course of the proof we established also the following:

Corollary 9.6. *The map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$, which is the composition of $\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$ and the natural projection $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$, is independent of the choice of $\mathbf{d}_v$.*

(Of course, the maps $\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}}$ and $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta$, do depend on the choice of $\mathbf{d}_v$.)

Corollary 9.7. *The schemes $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ are of finite type.*

(Indeed, the ind-scheme ${}^{Huge}\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ is of ind-finite type, and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ is the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^a_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty, \mathbf{D}_0)$ inside ${}^{Huge}\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$.)

9.8. **Beilinson-Drinfeld-Kottwitz flag space.** Consider the ind-scheme $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}}$ fibered over over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, which classifies the data of

- A divisor $D \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$,
- A principal G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ on $\mathbf{X}$,
- A trivialization $\mathcal{F}_G \simeq \mathcal{F}^0_G|_{\mathbf{X}-D}$, and
- A reduction to P of the G-torsor $\mathcal{F}_G|_{0_\mathbf{X}}$.

We have an evident map $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}$, which remembers of the trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_G$ on $\mathbf{X} - D$ its restriction to the formal neighborhood of $\infty_\mathbf{X}$. Moreover, it is easy to see that the map $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ is in fact a closed embedding.

Thus, we can consider the relative based quasi-maps' space $\mathrm{QMaps}\left(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}}\right)$, fibered over $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$, which is a closed subscheme inside $\mathrm{QMaps}\left(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}\right) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

As in Proposition 4.7, we obtain that the parabolic Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ can be alternatively defined as the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ in the product

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta\left(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}}\right) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a\left(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G,$$

where a is the projection of θ under $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathbb{Z}$.

The above realization of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ gives an alternative proof that $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ is a scheme of finite type, since $\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}}$ is of ind-finite type.

We will establish another important property of parabolic Uhlenbeck spaces (going back to the work [Va] of G. Valli), called the *vertical factorization property*:

Proposition 9.9. *Let $\theta = (\overline{\theta}, a)$ be an element of $\widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. If $a = a_1 + a_2$ is such that $\theta_1 = \theta - a_2 \cdot \delta$ also lies in $\widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, then there are canonical isomorphisms*

$$\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)})_{disj} \simeq$$

$$(\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_G) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)})_{disj}, \ \textit{and}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)})_{disj} \simeq$$

$$(\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_G) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)})_{disj}.$$

If $\theta - \delta \notin \Lambda^{pos}_{aff,\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, then the composition $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G \xrightarrow{\varpi^a_v} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ maps to the point $a \cdot 0_\mathbf{X} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

Proof. First of all, the usual Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ has the vertical factorization property

$$\mathfrak{U}^a_G \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj} \simeq (\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_G \times \mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_G) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj}, \tag{20}$$

because $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{X}$ play symmetric roles in the definition of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

Using (19) we obtain that the corresponding factorization property for the open subscheme $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ follows from that of $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$.

To establish the factorization property of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ we will use the fact (cf. [Ga]) that

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)})_{disj} \simeq \tag{21}$$

$$(\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_\mathbf{X}} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times} (\mathbf{X}^{(a_1)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_\mathbf{X})^{(a_2)})_{disj}. \tag{22}$$

Moreover, this decomposition is compatible with the corresponding line bundles. Therefore, (21) combined with (20) and Lemma 1.15 yield an isomorphism:

$$\left(\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_{\mathbf{X}}}\right)\underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^{a}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)}{\times}\mathfrak{U}^{a}_{G}\right)\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)}\times(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a_2)})_{disj}\simeq$$

$$\left(\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta_1}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_{\mathbf{X}}}\right)\times\mathrm{QMaps}^{a_2}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)\right)\underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^{a_1}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)\times\mathrm{QMaps}^{a_2}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)}{\times}$$

$$\times(\mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_{G}\times\mathfrak{U}^{a_2}_{G})\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)}\times(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a_2)}}{\times}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)}\times(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a_2)})_{disj}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ is the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}',\mathbf{D}'_{\infty};\mathbf{D}'_0)$ in the product

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_{\mathbf{X}}}\right)\underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^{a}\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)}{\times}\mathfrak{U}^{a}_{G},$$

we conclude that it factorizes in the required fashion.

To prove the assertion for $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$, recall that it is the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}',\mathbf{D}'_{\infty};\mathbf{D}'_0)$ in the product $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}\times\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$.

Note also that we have a natural closed embedding $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}}\to\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$, such that we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj}\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)}}{\times}\left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}',\mathbf{D}'_{\infty};\mathbf{D}'_0)\times\mathrm{Bun}^{a_2}_{G}(\mathbf{S}',\mathbf{D}'_{\infty})\right) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}}\\ \sim\downarrow & & \downarrow\\ (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_1)}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a_2)})_{disj}\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}}{\times}\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}',\mathbf{D}'_{\infty};\mathbf{D}'_0) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}.\end{array}$$

Therefore, the factorization property for $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ follows from that for $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$.

Suppose now that $\theta-\delta\notin\widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. Since $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_{\infty};\mathbf{D}_0)$ is dense in $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$, it is enough to prove that

$$\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_{\infty};\mathbf{D}_0)\to\mathrm{Bun}^{a}_{G}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_{\infty})\overset{\varpi^{a}_{v}}{\longrightarrow}\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$$

is the constant map to $a\cdot 0_{\mathbf{X}}\in\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$.

If this were not the case, there would exist $a_1,a_2\neq 0$ with $a_1+a_2=a$ and a based map

$$\mathbf{C}\to\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_{\mathbf{X}}}\times\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$$

of total degree θ, such that its projection onto the second factor, i.e. $\mathbf{C}\to\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ was not the constant map. However, the space of such maps is the union over $b\in\mathbb{Z}$ of

$$\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta-b\cdot\delta}(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_{\mathbf{X}}})\times\mathrm{Maps}^{b}(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}),$$

which is non-empty only when $b\geq 0$ and $\theta-b\cdot\delta\in\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. But this forces $b=0$, i.e., our map $\mathbf{C}\to\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_2}_{G,\mathbf{X}}$ must actually be the constant map.

□

10. Stratification of parabolic Uhlenbeck spaces

10.1. For an element $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ consider a decomposition $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2 + b\cdot\delta$ with $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} - 0$, $b \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us denote by $\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ the complement to $\mathbf{D}_0$ in $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, and let us denote by $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$ the following scheme:

$$\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}).$$

The following is a generalization of Theorem 7.2:

Theorem 10.2. *There exists a finite map $\overline{\iota}_{\theta_2,b} : \mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$, compatible with the factorization isomorphisms of Corollary 9.4 and Proposition 9.9. Moreover, the composition*

$$\iota_{\theta_2,b} : \mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$$

is a locally closed embedding, and $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P} \simeq \underset{\theta_2,b}{\cup} \mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$.

Proof. We construct a map $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ as follows:

The projection $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ is the map

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^d(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_G \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a_2)} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathfrak{U}^{a_1}_G \times \mathrm{Sym}^{a_2+b}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \overset{\overline{\iota}_{a_2+b}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{U}^a_G,$$

where $\overline{\iota}_{a_2+b}$ is as in Theorem 7.2.

The projection $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$ is

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta_1}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b)} \to$$
$$\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta_1}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2+b\cdot\delta} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}),$$

where the first arrow in the above composition uses the map $\pi_v : \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(b)}$, the second arrow corresponds to the addition of divisors, and the third arrow comes from (3). It is easy to see that the resulting map $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \times \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ indeed maps to the fiber product $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ and that the map $\iota_{\theta_2,b}$ is a locally closed embedding.

Moreover, it is easy to see that the image of $\overline{\iota}_{\theta_2,b}$ belongs in fact to the subscheme

$$\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}\left(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,P,\mathbf{X},0_{\mathbf{X}}}\right) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a\left(\mathbf{C},\mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a}_{G,\mathbf{X}}\right)}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G,$$

and that this map is compatible with the isomorphisms of Proposition 9.9.

The map $\overline{\iota}_{\theta_2,b}$ is also compatible with factorization isomorphisms (9.4) (due to the corresponding property of the map $\overline{\iota}_b$ for the Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$). Therefore, to prove that the image of $\overline{\iota}_{\theta_2,b}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ (i.e., to the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ in the product $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$), it suffices to analyze separately the following cases: a) $\theta_2 = 0, b = 0$; b) $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = 0$; c) $\theta_1 = 0, b = 0$. Of course, case a) is trivial, since it corresponds to the open stratum, i.e. $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ itself.

The second case, when $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = 0$, follows immediately from Proposition 9.9. Indeed, the preimage of $(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(b)}$ under $\mathfrak{U}^{b\cdot\delta}_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^b_G \xrightarrow{\varpi^b_h} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(b)}$ in this case is isomorphic to

$$\mathfrak{U}^b_G \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(b)}}{\times} (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(b)},$$

which contains $\mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ as a closed subscheme, according to Theorem 7.2.

Thus it remains to treat the case $\theta_1 = 0, b = 0$. We will use again the horizontal factorization property, i.e. Corollary 9.4, which allows us to assume that θ_2 is the projection of a simple coroot of $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$.

To show that the image of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \simeq \mathrm{Bun}^0_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathrm{Sym}^0(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ belongs to $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$, we will consider a certain $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

We choose a direction $\mathbf{d}_v \in \mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h$ and consider the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathbf{S}$ as in Proposition 7.7. This action induces a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$, which we shall call "the action of the first kind". Note that the corresponding action on the first factor, i.e. $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$, corresponds to the canonical homomorphism $\mathbb{G}_m \to M_{aff} \times \mathbb{G}_m$, where the latter is thought of as the Levi subgroup corresponding to the parabolic $\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{aff}$.

Another $\mathbb{G}_m$-action, which we shall call "the action of the second kind", corresponds to a dominant central cocharacter $\overline{\nu} : \mathbb{G}_m \to Z(M)$, as in Proposition 2.6.

Note that the actions of the first and the second kind commute with one another, and the compound $\mathbb{G}_m$-action, which we shall call "new", corresponds to a cocharacter $\mathbb{G}_m \to M_{aff} \times \mathbb{G}_m$, which satisfies the dominance condition of Proposition 2.6. Using this proposition, combined with Proposition 7.7, we obtain that the "new" action contracts the space $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ to $\iota_{\theta,0}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$. This contraction map is dominant, due to its equivariance with respect to the action of $\mathbb{A}^1 \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$ by horizontal shifts.

In particular, we obtain that $\iota_{\theta,0}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$ lies in the closure of $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$, which is what we had to show.

Now let us show that every geometric point of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ belongs to one of the locally closed subschemes $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$. We will argue by induction on the length of θ.

Consider the map $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G$, and let $z \in \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ be the image of our geometric point. If z has a singularity at $\mathbf{s} \in \overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, then $\varpi^a_v(z) \neq a \cdot 0_{\mathbf{X}}$, and by Proposition 9.9, $\theta - \delta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. Hence, our geometric point is contained in the image of $\overline{i}_{0,1}$, and our assertion follows from the induction hypothesis.

If z has a singularity at $\mathbf{s} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}}$, then our geometric point is contained in the image of $\overline{i}_{\alpha_0,0}$, and again the assertion follows by the induction hypothesis.

Hence, it remains to analyze the case when z belongs to $\mathrm{Bun}^a_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty)$, i.e. we are dealing with the locus of $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ isomorphic to

$$\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}^{\overline{\theta}}_P(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}}),$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}^{\overline{\theta}}_P(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$ is the corresponding version of Drinfeld's stack of generalized P-bundles on $\mathbf{C}$ with a trivialization at $\infty_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{C}$.

The assertion in this case follows from the corresponding property of Drinfeld's compactifications, cf. [BG1].

□

10.3. In the course of the proof of Theorem 10.2 we have established the following:

Corollary 10.4. *The "new" $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^a(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ preserves $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$ and contracts it to the subscheme $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta \overset{i_{\theta,0}}{\hookrightarrow} \mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$. The contraction map $\mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta$ coincides with the map $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$.*

In what follows, we will sometimes use the notation $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ for the map $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta \to \mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$.

10.5. Now we turn to the space $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$. For $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2 + b \cdot \delta$, let us denote by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$ the preimage in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ of the locally closed subset $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \subset \mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P}$.

Proposition 10.6. *We have an isomorphism on the level of reduced schemes:*

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \simeq \left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\right) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}).$$

Proof. Recall the map $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}) \to \mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$, and note that we have a natural closed embedding

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^\theta_{G;P} \underset{\mathrm{QMaps}^\theta(\mathbf{C},\mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})}{\times} \widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^\theta(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}).$$

Hence, we *a priori* have a closed embedding

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \to \left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2+b\cdot\delta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\right) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}),$$

by Proposition 2.34. However, using the vertical factorization property, Proposition 9.9, we obtain that its image is in fact contained in $\left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\right) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$. Thus, we have to show that the above inclusion is in fact an equality on the level of reduced schemes.

Using again the vertical factorization property, we can assume that $b = 0$. We know (cf. Lemma 3.6) that the map $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty) \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$, given by restriction of G-bundles under $\mathbf{C} \simeq \mathbf{D}_0 \to \mathbf{S}$, is smooth. Hence, the map

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \simeq \\ &\simeq \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathrm{Bun}_P(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_P(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})\end{aligned}$$

is smooth as well. Therefore, the scheme $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_G(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$ is irreducible, and our surjectivity assertion is enough to check at the generic point.

Consider the map

$$\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \to \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2}\right).$$

It is sufficient to analyze the locus which projects to pairs of simple and mutually disjoint divisors in $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_1} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2}$. Moreover using the horizontal factorization property, we reduce the assertion to the case when $\theta_1 = 0$, and $\theta_2 = \theta$ is the projection of a simple coroot in $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$.

For θ of the form $(\overline{\theta}, 0)$ we have an isomorphism $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} \simeq \widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}^{\overline{\theta}}_{P}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$. Therefore, if θ is the projection of a coroot belonging to $\mathfrak{g}$, our assertion follows from the corresponding fact for $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}^{\overline{\theta}}_{P}(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$, cf. [BFGM]. Hence, it remains to consider the case when θ is the projection of the simple affine coroot α_0.

Consider the "new" $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ as in Corollary 10.4. In the same way we obtain a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$, which contracts this space to

$$\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}}{\times} \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \subset \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P} \underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}}{\times} \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\,.$$

Thus, it is enough to show that the map $\varrho^{\theta}_{M_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} \to \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$ is dominant. Of course, it is sufficient to prove that the restriction of $\varrho^{\theta}_{M_{aff}}$ to $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ is dominant.

Let us fix a point $\mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$ and consider the the preimage of $a \cdot \mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$ under

$$\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \to \mathrm{Bun}^{a}_{G}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty) \xrightarrow{\varpi^a_h} \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)},$$

which we will denote by $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$, cf. Sect. 14.2. The map $\varrho^{\theta}_{M_{aff}}$ gives rise to a map $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}} := \mathrm{Gr}_{M_{aff}} \cap \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$.

Recall (cf. Sect. 13.7) that the affine Grassmannian Gr_M is a union of locally closed subsets Gr^{ν}_M, $\nu \in \Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{m}}$, and $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{\nu}_M = \underset{\nu' \leq \nu}{\cup} \mathrm{Gr}^{\nu'}_M$. Note that on the level of reduced schemes, $(\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}})_{red}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{w_0^M(\overline{\theta})}_M$, where w_0^M is the longest element in the Weyl group of M.

Recall now that we have fixed θ to be α_0. Therefore, the complement to $\mathrm{Gr}^{-w_0^M(\overline{\alpha}_0)}_M$ in $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{-w_0^M(\overline{\alpha}_0)}_M$ is a point-orbit corresponding to $\mathrm{Gr}^{0,+}_{M_{aff}} \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathrm{Gr}^{\alpha_0,+}_{M_{aff}}$ (unless $M = T$). Therefore, using Corollary 14.4, we conclude that if the map $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\alpha_0}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\alpha_0,+}_{M_{aff}}$ were not dominant for some (and hence, every) point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$, we would obtain that for every geometric point of $\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$, the corresponding P-bundle on $\mathbf{C}$ is such that the induced M-bundle is trivial. However, since $\mathbf{C}$ is of genus 0, this would mean the G-bundle on $\mathbf{C}$ is trivial. But this is a contradiction: we know (cf. Proposition 3.4) that there must exist a horizontal line $\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{x}$ such that the restriction of the G-bundle to it is non-trivial, but according to the second part of Proposition 9.9, this point $\mathbf{x}$ must equal $0_{\mathbf{X}}$.

□

In what follows, we will denote by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$ the map $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$.

10.7. **Functorial definitions in the parabolic case.** Let us briefly discuss alternative definitions of $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$, which will be functorial in the spirit of ${}^{Drinf}\mathfrak{U}^{a}_{G}$. We will consider $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$, since the case of $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ is analogous (and simpler).

Consider the functor ${}^{Funct}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$: { Schemes } → { Sets } that assigns to a scheme S the data of:

- An S-point of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$. (In particular, we obtain a G-bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ defined on an open subset $U \subset \mathbf{S} \times S$ such that $\mathbf{S} \times S - U$ is finite over S. Let $D \subset \mathbf{C} \times S$ be a relative Cartier divisor such that $\mathbf{C} \times S - D \subset U \cap \mathbf{C} \times S$.)
- A meromorphic enhanced quasi-map $\sigma \in {}_{\infty \cdot D_h}\widetilde{\mathrm{QMaps}}^{\overline{\theta}}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{F}_G \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$. (In particular, we have an M-bundle $\mathcal{F}_M$ defined on $\mathbf{C} \times S$),

such that the following condition is satisfied:

For any direction $\mathbf{d}_v \in \mathbf{D}_\infty - \mathbf{d}_h$, and the corresponding decomposition $\mathbf{S}' \simeq \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X}$, the meromorphic enhanced quasi-map

$$\widehat{\sigma} : \mathbf{C} \to \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}},$$

obtained from $\mathcal{F}_G$ and σ, is in fact regular.

As before one shows that the functor ${}^{Funct}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ is representable by an ind-scheme of ind-finite type.

Theorem 10.8. *There exists a canonical closed embedding $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to {}^{Funct}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$, which induces an isomorphism on the level of geometric points.*

Proof. The closed embedding $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P} \to {}^{Funct}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ has been constructed in Sect. 9.5.

Consider a geometric point of ${}^{Funct}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$, and let $\mathbf{s}_1, ..., \mathbf{s}_k$ be the points of $\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, where the corresponding point $z \in \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ has a singularity, and let $b_1, ..., b_k$ be the corresponding multiplicities. Let also $\mathbf{c}_1, ..., \mathbf{c}_n$ be the points on $\mathbf{D}_0 \simeq \mathbf{C}$, where the enhanced meromorphic quasi-map σ (as in the definition of ${}^{Funct}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$) is either non-defined or has a singularity.

Let us choose a direction $\mathbf{d}_v$ so that the points $\mathbf{c}_i$ are disjoint from $\pi_v(\mathbf{s}_j)$. Then, the enhanced quasi-map $\widehat{\sigma}$ (as in the definition of ${}^{Funct}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$) has singularities only at the above points $\mathbf{c}_i$ and $\pi_v(\mathbf{s}_j)$. Let $\theta_i \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ denote the defect of $\widehat{\sigma}$ at $\mathbf{c}_i$. The defect of $\widehat{\sigma}$ at $\pi_v(\mathbf{s}_j)$ is automatically equal to $b_j \cdot \delta$.

Set $\theta' = \theta - \sum\limits_i \theta_i - \sum\limits_j b_j \cdot \delta$. According to Proposition 2.34, the quasi-map $\widehat{\sigma}$ can be described as its saturation $\widehat{\sigma}' \in \mathrm{Bun}^{\theta'}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ and the corresponding positive modification, i.e., a point in

$$pt \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_{M_{aff}}(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \left(\prod_j \mathcal{H}^{b_j \cdot \delta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C},\pi_v(\mathbf{s}_j)} \times \prod_i \mathcal{H}^{\theta_i,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C},\mathbf{c}_i} \right),$$

where $pt \in \mathrm{Bun}_{M_{aff}}$ corresponds to the pair $\mathcal{F}_M$ (cf. the definition of ${}^{Funct}\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$) and the line bundle corresponding to the divisor $\varpi^a_h(z)$ (for $z \in \mathfrak{U}^a_G$ as above).

The theorem now follows from the description of points of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_G$ given by Proposition 10.6. □

11. The boundary

11.1. Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a scheme of finite type, whose underlying reduced sub-scheme $\mathcal{Y}_{red}$ is irreducible; let $\mathcal{Y}_n \to \mathcal{Y}_{red}$ be its normalization. Let $\mathcal{Y}' \subset \mathcal{Y}$ be a closed subset, and let $\mathcal{Y}'_n$ be the preimage of $\mathcal{Y}'$ in $\mathcal{Y}_n$.

Definition 11.2. *$\mathcal{Y}'$ will be called a quasi-effective Cartier divisor if there exists a line bundle $\mathcal{P}$ on $\mathcal{Y}$, and a meromorphic (i.e., defined over a dense open subset) section $s : \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{P}$, such that*

- *The section s is an isomorphism on $\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}'$,*
- *The section $s_n : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_n} \to \mathcal{P} \underset{\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Y}}{\otimes} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}_n}$ is regular,*

- *The set of zeroes of s_n coincides with $\mathcal{Y}'_n$.*

The notion of quasi-effective Cartier divisor is useful because of the following lemma:

Lemma 11.3. *Let $\mathcal{Y}' \subset \mathcal{Y}$ be a quasi-effective Cartier divisor, and let $Z \subset \mathcal{Y}'$ be a non-empty irreducible subvariety, not contained in $\mathcal{Y}'$. Then* $\dim(Z \cap \mathcal{Y}') = \dim(Z) - 1$.

Proof. Let Z_n be the preimage of Z in $\mathcal{Y}_n$. It is sufficient to show that $\dim(Z_n \cap \mathcal{Y}'_n) = \dim(Z_n) - 1$, but this is true, because $\mathcal{Y}'_n$ is a Cartier divisor in $\mathcal{Y}_n$. □

Here is a simple criterion how to show that a subset $\mathcal{Y}'$ is a quasi-effective Cartier divisor. Suppose that we are given a line bundle $\mathcal{P}$ on $\mathcal{Y}$ with a trivialization $s_n : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{P}$ over $\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}'$. Suppose also that $\mathcal{Y}'$ contains a dense subset of the form $\underset{i}{\cup} \mathcal{Y}'_i$, where $\mathcal{Y}'_i \subset \mathcal{Y}$ are subvarieties of codimension 1, such that s has a zero at the generic point of each $\mathcal{Y}'_i$.

Lemma 11.4. *Under the above circumstances, $\mathcal{Y}'$ is a quasi-effective Cartier divisor.*

11.5. **The finite-dimensional case.** Recall the space $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ (cf. Sect. 2.4) defined for any projective curve $\mathbf{C}$. By definition, the boundary of $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ is the closed subset $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})) := \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}) - \mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$.

Theorem 11.6. *The boundary $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$ is a quasi-effective Cartier divisor in $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$.*

The idea of the proof given below is borrowed from Faltings's approach to the construction of the determinant line bundle on the moduli space of bundles on a curve, cf. [Fa].

Recall that the moduli space $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ is equipped with the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})}$. Its $2\check{h}$-th tensor power can be identified with the determinant line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}),det}$, whose fiber at $\mathcal{F}_G \in \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ is $\det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G})\right)$.

Let us consider the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})}$ on the stack $\mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})$, whose fiber at $\mathcal{F}_T \in \mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})$ is

$$\underset{\check{\alpha}}{\otimes} \det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{L}^{\check{\alpha}}_{\mathcal{F}_T})\right),$$

where $\check{\alpha}$ runs over the set of all roots of $\mathfrak{g}$.

We have the canonical projections $p_G : \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ and $p_T : \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})$, and we define the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})}$ on $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ as $p_G^*((\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}),det})^{-1}) \otimes p_T^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})})$.

Observe that over the open part $\mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C}) \subset \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ we have an (almost canonical) trivialization of $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})}$. Indeed for a point $\mathcal{F}_B \in \mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$, with the induced G- and T- bundle being $\mathcal{F}_G$ and $\mathcal{F}_T$, respectively, the vector bundle $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G}$ has a filtration with the successive quotients being $\mathcal{L}^{\check{\alpha}}_{\mathcal{F}_T}$, and the trivial bundle $\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathcal{O}$. Hence,

$$\det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{F}_G})\right) \simeq \underset{\check{\alpha}}{\otimes} \det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{L}^{\check{\alpha}}_{\mathcal{F}_T})\right) \otimes \det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{O})\right)^{\dim(T)}.$$

In order to be able to apply Lemma 11.4, we need to analyze the behavior of the section $s : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})}$ just constructed at the generic point at each irreducible component of $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$.

It is well-known (cf. [BG1]) that $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$ contains as a dense subset the following codimension 1 locus: it is the union of connected components enumerated by the vertices of the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}$; each such component $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))_i$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{C} \times \mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$, and we have an identification

$$\mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C}) \cup \partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))_i \simeq \mathrm{Bun}_{P_i}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_{M_i}(\mathbf{C})}{\times} \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_{B_i}(\mathbf{C}),$$

where P_i (resp., M_i) is the corresponding subminimal parabolic (resp., its Levi quotient), and $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_{B_i}(\mathbf{C})$ is the corresponding space for the group M_i, cf. Lemma 2.9 and Corollary 2.10.

This reduces our problem to the following calculation. Let G be a reductive group of semi-simple rank 1 and the derived group isomorphic to SL_2, and let $\mathcal{V}$ be an irreducible G-module of dimension $n+1$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}),\mathcal{V}}$ be the line bundle on $\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$ given by

$$\mathcal{F}_G \mapsto \det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{F}_G})\right),$$

and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C}),\mathcal{V}}$ be the line bundle on $\mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})$ given by

$$\mathcal{F}_T \mapsto \underset{\check{\mu}}{\otimes} \det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{L}^{\check{\mu}}_{\mathcal{F}_T})\right),$$

where $\check{\mu}$ runs over the set of weights of $\mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}),\mathcal{V}}$ be the corresponding line bundle on $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$, and s its trivialization over $\mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$.

Lemma 11.7. *The section s has a zero of order $\frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{6}$ along the boundary $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$.*

Proof. Recall that for groups of semi-simple rank 1, the stack $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ is smooth, and the variety $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$ is irreducible.

First of all, it is easy to to see that our initial group can be replaced by GL_2, such that $\mathcal{V}$ is the n-th symmetric power of the standard representation. We will construct a map of the projective line $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$, such that $\mathbb{A}^1 \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ maps to the open part $\mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$, and the intersection $\mathbb{P}^1 \cap \partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$ is transversal, and such that the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}),\mathcal{V}}$ to $\mathbb{P}^1$ has degree $\frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{6}$.

Fix a point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$ and a point $\mathcal{F}_B \in \mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$, i.e. a vector bundle $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbf{C}$ and a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{L}_2 \to 0.$$

Consider the projective line of all elementary lower modifications of $\mathcal{M}$ at $\mathbf{c}$. This $\mathbb{P}^1$ maps to $\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ by setting the new T-bundle to be $(\mathcal{L}_1(-\mathbf{c}), \mathcal{L}_2)$. The required properties of the embedding $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$ are easy to verify. By construction, the composition $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}) \overset{p_T}{\to} \mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})$ is the constant map; therefore, it suffices to calculate the degree of the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}),\mathcal{V}}$ under $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}) \overset{p_G}{\to} \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$.

But for a lower modification $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{M}$, the quotient $\mathrm{Sym}^n(\mathcal{M})/\mathrm{Sym}^n(\mathcal{M}')$ has a canonical n-step filtration with successive quotients isomorphic to

$$(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}')^{\otimes j} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^{n-j}(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}(-x)).$$

Therefore, on the level of determinant lines, $\det\left(R\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathrm{Sym}^n(\mathcal{M}'))\right)$ is isomorphic to a fixed 1-dimensional vector space, times $(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}')^{\otimes \frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{6}}$.

□

This implies the assertion of the theorem.

11.8. We will now formulate and prove an analog of Theorem 11.6 for Uhlenbeck spaces on $\mathbb{P}^2$.

For $\mu \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$, consider the open subset $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ in $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ equal to the union of the strata $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu;0,b}_{G;B}$. In other words, $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ consists of points, which have no singularities along $\mathbf{D}_0$. (This means that the induced point of $\mathfrak{U}^{a}_{G}$ gives rise to a bundle $\mathcal{F}_G$ defined in a neighborhood of $\mathbf{D}_0$, and the corresponding quasi-map $\mathbf{C} \to \mathcal{F}_G|_{\mathbf{C}} \overset{G}{\times} \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ is in fact a map.) Of course, $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ contains

$\mathrm{Bun}^{\mu}_{G;B}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$ as an open subset, and from Theorem 10.2 we obtain that the complement is of codimension at least 2.

We define the boundary $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}) \subset \mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ as the complement $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B} - \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\mu}_{G;B}$. From Theorem 10.2, we obtain that $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B})$ contains a dense subset of codimension 1 equal to the disjoint union over $i \in I_{aff}$ of

$$\partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B})_i := \mathfrak{U}^{\mu;\alpha_i,0}_{G;B} \simeq \mathrm{Bun}^{\mu-\alpha_i}_{G;B}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}.$$

Remark. Note also that $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ is regular at the generic point of each $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B})_i$ (in particular, $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ is regular in codimension 1.) Indeed, from Theorem 10.2, it is easy to deduce that the open subset

$$\mathrm{Bun}^{\mu}_{G;B}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0) \bigcup \left(\underset{i \in I_{aff}}{\cup} \mathfrak{U}^{\mu;\alpha_i,0}_{G;B} \right)$$

projects one-to-one on the open subset in $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\mu}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}})$ equal to

$$\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}, \mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}}) \bigcup \left(\underset{i \in I_{aff}}{\cup} \partial(\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,P,\mathbf{X}}))_i \right),$$

and the latter is smooth, by Lemma 2.9.

Theorem 11.9. *The boundary $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B})$ is a quasi-effective Cartier divisor in $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this theorem.

11.10. Let us choose a pair of directions $(\mathbf{d}_v, \mathbf{d}_h)$, and consider the corresponding decomposition $\mathbf{S}' \simeq \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{X}$. From the map $\varpi^a_v : \mathfrak{U}^a_G \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}{}^{(a)}$ we obtain a relative divisor on $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \times \mathbf{X}$, and the associated line bundle.

We define the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},G}$ on $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ as the restriction of the above line bundle to $\mathfrak{U}^a_G \times 0_{\mathbf{X}} \subset \mathfrak{U}^a_G \times \mathbf{X}$.

Let $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^a_G$ be the open subset in $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$ corresponding to points with no singularity along $\mathbf{D}_0$. We have a canonical projection $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^a_G \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}, \infty_{\mathbf{C}})$.

The next assertion follows from the construction of the map ϖ^a_v:

Lemma 11.11. *The restriction of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},G}$ to $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^a_G$ can be canonically identified with the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})}$ under $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^a_G \to \mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})$.*

We have a canonical projection $p_{T,aff}$ from $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ to $\mathrm{Bun}_{T_{aff}}(\mathbf{C})$. We define the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$ on $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ as the tensor product of the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})}$ under

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B} \overset{p_{T,aff}}{\longrightarrow} \mathrm{Bun}_{T_{aff}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_T(\mathbf{C})$$

and the inverse of the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}^{\otimes 2 \cdot h^\vee}_{\mathfrak{U},G}$ under $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B} \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

We claim that over $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\mu}_{G;B}$ there is a canonical trivialization of $s : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$. Indeed, we have a projection $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\mu}_{G;B} \to \mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$, and the restriction of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$ is the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})}$ under this map. Therefore, the existence of the trivialization follows from the corresponding fact for $\mathrm{Bun}_B(\mathbf{C})$, using the fact that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C}),det} \simeq \mathcal{P}^{\otimes 2 \cdot h^\vee}_{\mathrm{Bun}_G(\mathbf{C})}$.

Thus, to prove Theorem 11.9, it remains to show that the above meromorphic section s has a zero at the generic point of each $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B})_i$, $i \in I_{aff}$.

When $i \in I \subset I_{aff}$, this readily follows from Theorem 11.6, since in this case $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B})_i$ is contained in the preimage of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^a_G$ in $\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B}$.

Therefore, it remains to analyze the behavior of s on the open subvariety

$$\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B} - \overline{\underset{i\in I}{\cup} \partial(\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B})_i}$$

at the generic point of $\partial(\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B})_{i_0}$, where i_0 corresponds to the affine root.

Lemma 11.12. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a variety (regular in codimension 1), acted on by the group $\mathbb{G}_m$; let $\mathcal{P}$ be an equivariant line bundle, and $s : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{P}$ be an equivariant nowhere vanishing section defined outside an irreducible subvariety $\mathcal{Y}'$ of codimension 1.*

Suppose that there exists a point $y \in \mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}'$ such that the action map $\mathbb{G}_m \times y \to \mathcal{Y}$ extends to a map $\mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathcal{Y}$, such that the image of 0, call it y', belongs to $\mathcal{Y}'$. Assume moreover, that the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the fiber of $\mathcal{P}$ at y' (note that y' is automatically $\mathbb{G}_m$-stable) is given by a positive power of the standard character. Then s vanishes at the generic point of $\mathcal{Y}'$.

Proof. If we lift y to a geometric point in the normalization of $\mathcal{Y}$, the same conditions will hold; therefore we can assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is normal.

To prove the lemma we have to exclude the possibility that s has a pole of order ≥ 0 on $\mathcal{Y}'$. If it did, the same would be true for the pull-back of the pair $(\mathcal{P}, s)$ to $\mathbb{A}^1$, endowed with the standard $\mathbb{G}_m$-action. In the latter case, to have a pole of non-negative order means that $\mathcal{P} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}^1}(-n \cdot 0)$ with $n \geq 0$, but the action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ on the fiber of $\mathcal{P} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{A}^1}(-n \cdot 0)$ at 0 is given by the character $-n$, which is a contradiction.

□

Thus, to prove the theorem, we need to construct a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action as in the lemma and check its properties. Consider the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action "of the first kind" on $\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B}$, as in the proof of Theorem 10.2. The line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$ and the section s are $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant, by construction.

Let us now construct a point $y \in \mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B}$ as in the lemma. Let us write $\mu = (\overline{\mu}, a)$, and recall the projection

$$\varrho^\mu_{\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}} : \mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\mu \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\overline{\mu - a\cdot\delta}} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{(a)}.$$

Let y be any point of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^\mu_{G;B}$ which projects to a multiplicity-free point in $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\mu$. We claim that the $\mathbb{G}_m$ action will contract this point to a point y' on the subscheme

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\mu;a\cdot\alpha_0,0}_{G;B} \subset \overline{\partial(\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B})_{i_0}} \cap (\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B} - \overline{\underset{i\in I}{\cup} \partial(\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B})_i}).$$

Indeed, using the horizontal factorization property, Proposition 9.4, it suffices to analyze separately the cases when $a = 0$, and when and $\mu = \alpha_0$. In the former case, the assertion is trivial, since in this case $\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{G;B} \simeq \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}^{\overline{\mu}}_B(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{c})$, and the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action is trivial.

In the latter case, from Theorem 10.2, we obtain that the projection

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\alpha_0}_{G;B} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\alpha_0}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{G,B,\mathbf{x}})$$

is one-to-one. From the remark following Lemma 2.8, we obtain that $\mathrm{QMaps}^{\alpha_0}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}}) \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \times \mathbb{A}^1$, so that the $\mathbb{G}_m$ action comes from the standard $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathbb{A}^1$. Hence, $\mathfrak{U}^{\alpha_0}_{G;B} \to \mathrm{QMaps}^{\alpha_0}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff}})$ is an isomorphism, and the contraction statement in this case is manifest as well.

Thus, it remains to check that for any point $y' \in \mathfrak{U}^{\mu;a\cdot\alpha_0,0}_{G;B}$, the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the fiber of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$ at y' is given by a positive character. However, by construction this action is the same

as the $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on the fiber of $\mathcal{O}(a\cdot 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{\otimes 2\cdot h^\vee}$ at $0_{\mathbf{X}}\in\mathbf{X}$, i.e., corresponds to the $2\cdot a\cdot h^\vee$-th power of the standard character.

Thus, the theorem is proved.

11.13. **Remark.** Let us give another interpretation of the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$ for $G=SL_n$ in terms of the scheme $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^a_n$ classifying torsion-free sheaves on $\mathbf{S}$.

For $\mu=(\overline{\mu},a)$, and $\overline{\mu}=(\mu_1,...,\mu_n)$, consider the scheme $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^\mu_{n,flag}$ that classifies the data of

- A torsion free sheaf of generic rank n, denoted $\mathcal{M}$, on $\mathbf{S}$, which is locally free near $\mathbf{D}_\infty$, and with $ch_2(\mathcal{M})=-a$,
- A trivialization $\mathcal{M}|_{\mathbf{D}_\infty}\simeq\mathcal{O}^{\oplus n}$,
- A flag of locally free subsheaves

$$\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{M}_0\subset\mathcal{M}_1\subset...\subset\mathcal{M}_{n-1}\subset\mathcal{M}_n=\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_0),$$

such that each $\mathcal{M}_i/\mathcal{M}_{i-1}$ is a coherent sheaf on $\mathbf{D}_0$ of generic rank 1 and of degree μ_i.

On $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^\mu_{n,flag}$ there is a natural line bundle $\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}},B}$, whose fiber at a point $\mathcal{M}\subset\mathcal{M}_1\subset...\subset\mathcal{M}_{n-1}\subset\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_0)$ is the line:

$$\underset{i=1,...,n}{\otimes}\left(\det\left(R\Gamma(\det(\mathcal{M}_i/\mathcal{M}_{i-1}))\right)\otimes\det\left(R\Gamma(\mathcal{M}_i/\mathcal{M}_{i-1})\right)^{-1}\right).$$

In [FGK] it was shown that there exists a natural proper map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^\mu_{n,flag}\to\mathfrak{U}^\mu_{SL_n,B}$, which is in fact a semi-small resolution of singularities. One can show that the pull-back of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{U},B}$ to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}}^\mu_{n,flag}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}^{\otimes 2n}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{N}},B}$.

Part IV: Crystals

In this part, $\mathfrak{g}$ will be an arbitrary Kac-Moody Lie algebra, with the exception of Sect. 13, Sect. 15.5 and Sect. 15.6.

12. Crystals in general

12.1. We refer to [KaS], Section 3.1 for the definition of crystals associated to a Kac-Moody algebra. By a slight abuse of language, by crystal over $\mathfrak{g}$ we will actually mean a crystal over the Langlands dual algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, in particular, the weight function will take values in the lattice Λ.

Crystals form a category, where morphisms from B_1 to B_2 are the maps of sets $\mathsf{B}_1\to\mathsf{B}_2$, which preserve the e_i, f_i operations, and the ϵ_i, ϕ_i–functions for $i\in I$.

If $\mathfrak{m}$ is a Levi subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$, it corresponds to a subdiagram of the Dynkin graph, therefore it makes sense to talk about $\mathfrak{m}$-crystals. If B is a $\mathfrak{g}$-crystal, we will denote by the same character the underlying $\mathfrak{m}$-crystal. Similarly, for every $\mathfrak{m}$-crystal B we define a $\mathfrak{g}$-crystal structure on the same underlying set, by leaving $e_i,f_i,\epsilon_i,\phi_i$ for $i\in\mathfrak{m}$ unchanged, and declaring that for $j\notin\mathfrak{m}$, e_j,f_j send everything to 0, and $\epsilon_j=\phi_j=-\infty$.

12.2. Let $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ be a crystal. Our goal in this section is to review some extra structures and properties of $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ which allow to identify it with the standard crystal $\mathsf{B}^\infty_\mathfrak{g}$ that parametrizes the canonical basis in $U(\check{\mathfrak{n}})$, cf. [KaS], Section 3.2.

For $i\in I$, let $\mathfrak{m}_i$ be the corresponding subminimal Levi subalgebra. Let B_i be the $\mathfrak{g}$-crystal obtained in the above way from the "standard" $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-crystal. I.e., as a set it is $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ and consists of elements that we will denote $\mathsf{b}_i(n)$, $n\geq 0$ with $wt_i(\mathsf{b}_i(n))=n\cdot\check{\alpha}_i$, $f_i(\mathsf{b}_i(n))=\mathsf{b}_i(n-1)$, $\phi_i(\mathsf{b}_i(n))=n$, and all the operations for $j\neq i$ are trivial.

According to Proposition 3.2.3 of [KaS], we need to understand what kind of structure on $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ allows to construct maps $\Psi_i : \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \to \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathsf{B}_i$, satisfying the conditions (1)–(7) of *loc.cit.*

Our crystal $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ will automatically satisfy conditions (1)–(4), and it will be ϕ-normal, i.e.

$$\text{for } \mathsf{b} \in \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g},\ \phi_i(\mathsf{b}) = \max\{n \,|\, f_i^n(\mathsf{b}) \neq 0\}.$$

Then the ϵ-functions are defined by the rule

$$\phi_i(\mathsf{b}) = \epsilon_i(\mathsf{b}) + \langle wt(\mathsf{b}), \check{\alpha}_i \rangle.$$

12.3. We suppose that the set $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ carries *another* crystal structure (also assumed ϕ-normal), given by operations e_i^* and f_i^*, $i \in I$ with the same weight function wt. Assume also the following:

(a) The operations e_i, f_i commute with e_j^* and f_j^*, whenever $i \neq j$.

(b) For every vertex $i \in I$, we have a set decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} = \underset{n \in \mathbb{N}}{\cup} \mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}_i, \tag{23}$$

where

- $\mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ is an abstract set, $\mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ is the set underlying the finite $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-crystal of highest weight n, and B_i is as above.
- This decomposition respects both the e_i, f_i and the e_i^*, f_i^*-operations.
- The e_i, f_i–action on each $\mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}_i$ is the trivial action on $\mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$, times the action on $\mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}_i$ as on the tensor product of crystals.
- The e_i^*, f_i^*–action on each $\mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}_i$ is trivial on the first two factors times the standard action on B_i.

12.4. We claim that under the above circumstances, we do have canonical maps $\Psi_i : \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \to \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \times \mathsf{B}_i$, satisfying condition (6) of [KaS], Proposition 3.2.3.

Indeed, such maps obviously exist for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$, i.e. for each i we have a map of $\mathfrak{m}_i$-crystals

$$\Psi_i^{can} : \mathsf{B}_i \to \mathsf{B}_i \otimes \mathsf{B}_i.$$

We define the map Ψ_i on $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ in terms of the decomposition (23). Namely, on each $\mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{B}_i \subset \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$, Ψ_i is the identity map on the first two factors times Ψ_i^{can} on the third one.

In other words, each $\mathsf{b} \in \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ can be uniquely written in the form $(e_i^*)^n(\mathsf{b}')$, where $f_i^*(\mathsf{b}') = 0$, and

$$\Psi_i(\mathsf{b}) = \mathsf{b}' \otimes \mathsf{b}_i(n). \tag{24}$$

We claim that Ψ_i indeed respects the operations e_j and f_j. First, when $j \neq i$, the assertion follows immediately from (24), since f_i^*, e_i^* commute with e_j and f_j.

For $j = i$ the assertion is also clear, since we are dealing with the map of $\mathfrak{m}_i$-crystals

$$\mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \otimes \mathsf{B}_i \overset{\mathrm{id} \otimes \Psi_i^{can}}{\longrightarrow} \mathsf{B}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \otimes \mathsf{B}_i \otimes \mathsf{B}_i.$$

12.5. Finally, in order to apply the uniqueness theorem of [KaS], the crystal $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ must satisfy the "highest weight property" (i.e., condition (7) of Proposition 3.2.3 of *loc.cit.* It can be stated in either of the two ways:

For $\mathsf{b} \in \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ different from the canonical highest weight vector $\mathsf{b}(0)$

- there exists $i \in I$ such that $f_i(\mathsf{b}) \neq 0$
- there exists $i \in I$ such that $f_i^*(\mathsf{b}) \neq 0$.

Let us denote by $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ the subset of $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ consisting of elements annihilated by f_i^*. We claim that it also has a natural crystal structure. Indeed, the operations e_j and f_j obtained by restriction from $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ preserve $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i}$, since they commute with e_i^*.

The operations e_i and f_i are defined in terms of the decomposition (23). Namely,

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i} \cap (\mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^n \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^n \times \mathsf{B}_i) = (\mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^n \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^n) \times \mathsf{b}_i(0),$$

and we set e_i, f_i to act along the $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^n$–factor.

Moreover, note that the map Ψ_i constructed above maps $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ to $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i} \otimes \mathsf{B}_i$, and we claim that this is a map of crystals with respect to the crystal structure on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ introduced above. Moreover, one easily checks that this map is an isomorphism.

12.6. Thus, if $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ satisfies the highest weight property, and admits decompositions as in (23) for every i, it can be identified with the standard crystal $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$ of [KaS]. In what follows, we will need several additional properties of $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$.

Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be an arbitrary Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. (In our applications we will only consider Levi subalgebras that correspond to subdiagrams of finite type.) The following result is a generalization of what we have constructed for $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_i$, cf. [Ka4],[Ka5]:

Theorem 12.7. *For every Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{m}$ there exists an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$-crystals (with respect to the $e_i, f_i, \epsilon_i, \phi_i, i \in I$)*

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty} \simeq \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}} \otimes \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\infty},$$

(here $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\infty}$ is viewed as a $\mathfrak{g}$-crystal), such that

(a) *The operations e_i^*, f_i^* for $i \in \mathfrak{m}$ on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$ go over to the e_i^*, f_i^* operations along the second factor.*

(b) *The $\mathfrak{m}$-crystal structure on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ is normal.*

In particular, from this theorem we obtain that, as a set, $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ can be realized as a subset of $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$ consisting of elements annihilated by the f_i^*, $i \in \mathfrak{m}$. In terms of this set-theoretic embedding $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}} \to \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$, the operations $e_j, f_j, \epsilon_j, \phi_j$ for $j \notin \mathfrak{m}$ are induced from those on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$. For $i \in \mathfrak{m}$, the e_i and f_i operators on an element $\mathsf{b} \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ can be explicitly described as follows:

The element $f_i(\mathsf{b})$ (for the action that comes from $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$-crystal structure) equals $f_i(\mathsf{b})$ (for the action that is induced by the $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$-crystal structure). The element $e_i(\mathsf{b})$ (for the action coming from the $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$-crystal structure) equals $e_i(\mathsf{b})$ (for the action induced by the $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$-crystal structure) if the latter belongs to $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$, and 0 otherwise.

In addition, we have the following assertion, cf. [Ka3], Theorem 3:

Theorem 12.8. *The set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ parametrizes the canonical basis for $U(\mathfrak{n}(\check{\mathfrak{p}}))$, where $\check{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the corresponding parabolic subalgebra, and $\mathfrak{n}(\check{\mathfrak{p}})$ is its unipotent radical. Moreover, as a $\mathfrak{m}$-crystal, $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ splits as a disjoint union*

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}} = \underset{\nu}{\cup} \mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu} \otimes \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu},$$

where ν runs over the set of dominant integral weights of $\mathfrak{m}$, $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu}$ is the crystal associated to the integrable $\check{\mathfrak{m}}$-module V_M^{ν}, and $\mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu}$ parametrizes a basis in $\mathrm{Hom}_{\check{\mathfrak{m}}}(V_M^{\nu}, U(\mathfrak{n}(\check{\mathfrak{p}})))$.

Note that the set $\mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu}$ of the above theorem embeds into $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}$ as the set of those $\mathsf{b} \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\infty}(\nu)$, which are annihilated by f_i and f_i^* for $i \in \mathfrak{m}$.

13. Crystals via the affine Grassmannian

13.1. In this section we will take $\mathfrak{g}$ to be finite-dimensional, and give a construction of a crystal $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ using the affine Grassmannian Gr_G of G, in the spirit of [BG]. We will assume that the reader is familiar with the notation of *loc.cit.*

In the next section we will generalize this construction for an arbitrary Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, using the space $\mathrm{QMaps}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$ instead of the (non-existing in the general case) affine Grassmannian.

Recall that for a standard parabolic P, we denote by $N(P)$ (resp., M, P^-, $N(P^-)$) its unipotent radical (resp., the Levi subgroup, the corresponding opposite parabolic, etc.) By $B(M)$ (resp., $N(M)$, $B^-(M)$, $N^-(M)$) will denote the standard Borel subgroup in M (resp., unipotent radical of $B(M)$, etc.) Finally, recall that T denotes the Cartan subgroup of G.

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a (smooth, but not necessarily complete) curve, and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$ a point. We will choose a local parameter on $\mathbf{C}$ at $\mathbf{c}$ and call it t. Recall that if H is an algebraic group, we can consider the group-scheme $H[[t]]$, the group-indscheme $H((t))$ and the ind-scheme of ind-finite type $\mathrm{Gr}_H := H((t))/H[[t]]$, called the affine Grassmannian. In what follows we will consider the affine Grassmannians corresponding to the groups G, M, P, $N(P)$, etc.

For a coweight λ, we have a canonical point in $T((t))$, denoted t^λ. We will denote by the same character its image in Gr_T and Gr_G via the embedding of $\mathrm{Gr}_T \to \mathrm{Gr}_G$.

We have the maps $i_P : \mathrm{Gr}_P \to \mathrm{Gr}_G$, $i_{P^-} : \mathrm{Gr}_{P^-} \to \mathrm{Gr}_G$, which are locally closed embeddings on every connected component, and projections $\mathfrak{q}_P : \mathrm{Gr}_P \to \mathrm{Gr}_M$, $\mathfrak{q}_{P^-} : \mathrm{Gr}_{P^-} \to \mathrm{Gr}_M$. The projections $\mathfrak{q}_P$, $\mathfrak{q}_{P^-}$ induce a bijection on the set of connected components. For a coweight $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we will denote by Gr_T^λ (resp., Gr_B^λ, $\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^\lambda$) the corresponding connected component of Gr_T (resp., Gr_B, Gr_{B^-}).

13.2. It is known that the intersection $\mathrm{Gr}_B^{\lambda_1} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^{\lambda_2}$ is of pure dimension $\langle \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \check{\rho} \rangle$. Let us denote by $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}(\lambda)$ the set of irreducible components of the above intersection with parameters $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = \lambda$. (It is easy to see that the action of $t^{\lambda'} \in T((t))$ identifies $\mathrm{Gr}_B^{\lambda_1} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^{\lambda_2}$ with $\mathrm{Gr}_B^{\lambda_1+\lambda'} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^{\lambda_2+\lambda'}$.)

Our goal now is to show that the set $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} := \underset{\lambda}{\cup} \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}(\lambda)$ has a natural structure of $\mathfrak{g}$-crystal. We need to define the weight function $wt : \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \to \Lambda$; the functions $\epsilon_i, \phi_i : \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{Z}$ for $i \in I$, and the operations $e_i, f_i : \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \to \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g} \cup 0$.

Of course, the function wt is defined so that $wt(\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}(\lambda)) = \lambda$. The function ϕ_i is defined in terms of f_i by the normality condition:

$$\text{For } \mathsf{b} \in \mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g},\ \phi_i(\mathsf{b}) = max\{n \mid f_i^n(\mathsf{b}) \neq 0\}.$$

The function ϵ_i will be defined by the rule

$$\epsilon_i(\mathsf{b}) = \phi_i(\mathsf{b}) - \langle \check{\alpha}_i, wt(\mathsf{b}) \rangle.$$

Thus, we have to define the operations e_i and f_i.

13.3. First, let us assume that G is of semi-simple rank 1. Then we can identify the coroot lattice with $\mathbb{Z}$, and it is easy to see that $\mathrm{Gr}_B^\lambda \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^0$ is non-empty if and only if $\lambda = n \cdot \alpha$ (where α is the unique positive coroot), with $n \geq 0$. In the latter case, this intersection is an irreducible variety, isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^n - \mathbb{A}^{n-1}$. Thus, $\mathsf{B}_\mathfrak{g}$ in this case is naturally $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, and the definition of e_i and f_i is evident: they are the raising and the lowering operators, respectively.

In the case of a general G, the operations will be defined by reduction to the rank 1 case.

For a parabolic P and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, consider the intersection

$$\mathfrak{q}_P^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-} \subset \mathrm{Gr}_G,$$

projecting by means of $\mathfrak{q}_P$ on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}$.

Lemma 13.4. *The above intersection splits as a direct product*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)} \times \big((\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}\big)$$

for any $g \in \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}$.

Proof. The group $N^-(M)((t))$ acts transitively on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}$, and it also acts on Gr_G preserving the intersection $(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}$.

Moreover, for $g' \in \mathrm{Gr}_P \subset \mathrm{Gr}_G$ and $g = \mathfrak{q}_P(g')$, the inclusion

$$\mathrm{Stab}_{N^-(M)((t))}(g', \mathrm{Gr}_G) \subset \mathrm{Stab}_{N^-(M)((t))}(g, \mathrm{Gr}_M)$$

is an equality, since $N^-(M) \cap N(P) = 1$.

Therefore, for any g as above, the action of $N^-(M)((t))/\mathrm{Stab}_{N^-(M)((t))}(g, \mathrm{Gr}_M)$ on the fiber $(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}$ defines an isomorphism

$$(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-} \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)} \times \big((\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}\big).$$

□

We will use this lemma as follows. For $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu \in \Lambda$, let us note that the intersection

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B} \cap (\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-}$$

is the same as

$$(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-}.$$

In particular, by putting $\lambda_1 = \mu$ we obtain that the variety $(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}$ of Lemma 13.4 is finite dimensional of dim $\leq \langle \mu - \lambda, \check{\rho} \rangle$.

Of course, the variety $(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}$ depends up to isomorphism only on the difference $\mu' := \mu - \lambda$. Let us denote by $\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m},*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu')$ the set of irreducible components of $(\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-}$ of (the maximal possible) dimension $\langle \mu', \check{\rho} \rangle$.

Since the group $N^-(B)((t))$ is ind-pro-unipotent, we obtain that the stabilizer

$$\mathrm{Stab}_{N^-(M)((t))}(g, \mathrm{Gr}_M)$$

appearing in the proof of Lemma 13.4 is connected. Therefore, the set is $\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m},*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu')$ is well-defined, i.e. is independent of the choice of the point g.

Clearly, for every irreducible component $\mathbf{K}$ of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-}$ there exists a unique $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that the intersection $\mathbf{K} \cap (\mathfrak{q}_P)^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)})$ is dense in $\mathbf{K}$.

Using Lemma 13.4, we obtain that the set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$ can be canonically decomposed as a union

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) = \underset{\mu}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m},*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{25}$$

Finally, we are able to define the operations e_i and f_i. For each $i \in I$ take P to be the corresponding subminimal parabolic P_i and consider the decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) = \underset{\mu}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m}_i,*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda - \mu).$$

For an element $\mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$ of the form

$$\mathsf{b}' \times \mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{m}_i},\ \mathsf{b}' \in \mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m}_i,*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu),\ \mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda - \mu),$$

we set $e_i(\mathsf{b}_G)$ to be

$$\mathsf{b}' \times e_i(\mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}) \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i,*}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda + \alpha_i - \mu) \cup 0 \subset \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda + \alpha_i) \cup 0,$$

and similarly for f_i.

This is well-defined, because M_i is of semi-simple rank 1, and we know how the operators e_i and f_i act on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$.

13.5. Let us now define the operations e_i^* and f_i^*. First, when G is of semi-simple rank 1, we set $e_i^* = e_i$ and $f_i^* = f_i$. To treat the general case, we simply interchange the roles of the projections $\mathfrak{q}_P$ and $\mathfrak{q}_{P^-}$.

In more detail, for any λ and μ as before, let us consider the intersection

$$\mathrm{Gr}_B^\lambda \cap (\mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^\mu).$$

As in Lemma 13.4, this intersection can be represented as a product $\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^\mu \times \big((\mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}_B^\lambda\big)$ for any $g \in \mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^\mu$. For $\mu' = \lambda - \mu$, let us denote by $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu')$ the set of irreducible components of the top dimension of $(\mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(g) \cap \mathrm{Gr}_B^\lambda$.

By looking at the intersections of irreducible components of $\mathrm{Gr}_B^{\lambda_1} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^{\lambda_2}$ with the various $(\mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^\mu)$, we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) = \underset{\mu}{\cup} \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{26}$$

By taking $M = M_i$, for $\mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$ of the form

$$\mathsf{b}' \times \mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{m}_i},\ \mathsf{b}' \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\mu),\ \mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda - \mu),$$

we set $e_i^*(\mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ to be

$$\mathsf{b}' \times e_i^*(\mathsf{b}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}) \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda + \alpha_i - \mu) \cup 0 \subset \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda + \alpha_i) \cup 0,$$

and similarly for f_i^*.

Remark. Let us explain the consistence of the notation $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu)$. As we shall see later, the crystals $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ (and in particular $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$) have the highest weight property. If we assume that, we will obtain that the set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu)$ is precisely the subset of $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)$ consisting of elements annihilated by f_i^*, $i \in \mathfrak{m}$. Indeed, the latter elements correspond to the irreducible components of

$$\mathrm{Gr}_B^0 \cap (\mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^\mu \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^\mu)$$

of dimension $\langle \mu, \check{\rho} \rangle$, which is the same as the set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu)$.

Proposition 13.6. *For $i \neq j$, the operations e_i, f_i commute with the operations e_j^*, f_j^*.*

Proof. Consider the intersection $(\mathfrak{q}_{P_i})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M_i)}^{\mu_1}) \cap (\mathfrak{q}_{P_j^-})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M_j)}^{\mu_2}) \subset \mathrm{Gr}_G$. We claim that it decomposes as

$$(\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M_i)}^{\mu_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B(M_j)}^{\mu_2}) \times \big((\mathfrak{q}_{P_i})^{-1}(g_1) \cap (\mathfrak{q}_{P_j^-})^{-1}(g_2)\big)$$

for any $g_1 \times g_2 \in \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M_i)}^{\mu_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B(M_j)}^{\mu_2}$.

Indeed, as in the proof of Lemma 13.4, the group $N^-(M_i)((t)) \times N(M_j)((t))$ acts transitively on the base $\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M_i)}^{\mu_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B(M_j)}^{\mu_2}$, and since the subgroups $N^-(M_i), N(M_j) \subset G$ commute with one another, we obtain the desired decomposition as in Lemma 13.4.

For $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$, let us denote by $\mathsf{C}_{i,j}(\mu)$ the set of irreducible components of the top $(= \langle \mu, \check{\rho} \rangle)$ dimension of $(q_{P_i})^{-1}(g_1) \cap (q_{P_j^-})^{-1}(g_2)$.

By intersecting $\mathrm{Gr}_B^{\lambda_1} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-}^{\lambda_2}$ with $(\mathfrak{q}_{P_i})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M_i)}^{\mu_1}) \cap (\mathfrak{q}_{P_j^-})^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M_j)}^{\mu_2})$ for the various μ_1 and μ_2, we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) \simeq \underset{\mu_1,\mu_2}{\cup} \mathsf{C}_{i,j}(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda_1 - \mu_1) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_j}(\mu_2 - \lambda_2).$$

This decomposition is a refinement of (25) and (26). Therefore, for an element $\mathsf{b}_G \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$ of the form $\mathbf{c} \times \mathsf{b}_i \times \mathsf{b}_j$ with

$$\mathsf{c} \in \mathsf{C}_{i,j}(\mu_1 - \mu_2),\ \mathsf{b}_i \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda - \mu_1),\ \mathsf{b}_j \in \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_j}(\lambda - \mu_2),$$

the e_i and f_i operations act via their action on b_i, and the e_j^* and f_j^* act via b_j, respectively. This makes the required commutativity property manifest.

□

13.7. Finally, we are going to define the decompositions of $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ as in (23). In fact, we will define the decompositions as in Theorem 12.7 for any Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{m}$. First, we need to discuss certain $\mathfrak{m}$-crystals associated with the convolution diagram of M.

Let us recall some notation related to the affine Grassmannian Gr_M. The group-scheme $M[[t]]$ (being a subgroup of the group-indscheme $M((t))$) acts naturally on Gr_M, and its orbits are parametrized by the set $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}^+$ of dominant coweights of M; for $\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}^+$ we will denote the corresponding orbit by Gr_M^{ν}.

Let Conv_M denote the convolution diagram for M. It is by definition the ind-scheme parametrizing the data of $(\mathcal{F}_M, \mathcal{F}'_M, \beta, \widetilde{\beta}')$, where $\mathcal{F}_M, \mathcal{F}'_M$ are principal M-bundles on $\mathbf{C}$, β is a trivialization of $\mathcal{F}_M$ on $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{c}$, and $\widetilde{\beta}^1$) is an isomorphism $\mathcal{F}_M|_{\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c}} \to \mathcal{F}'_M|_{\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{c}}$. We will think of Conv_M as a fibration over Gr_M with the typical fiber Gr_M; more precisely

$$\mathrm{Conv}_M \simeq M((t)) \underset{M[[t]]}{\times} \mathrm{Gr}_M\,.$$

Sometimes, we will write $\mathrm{Conv}_M \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_M \star \mathrm{Gr}_M$, so that the first factor is perceived as a base, and the second one as the fiber. In particular, if $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathrm{Gr}_M$ is a sub-scheme, and $\mathcal{Y}' \subset \mathrm{Gr}_M$ is a $M[[t]]$-invariant subscheme, it makes sense to consider the subscheme $\mathcal{Y} \star \mathcal{Y}' \subset \mathrm{Gr}_M \star \mathrm{Gr}_M \simeq \mathrm{Conv}_M$. For $\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}^+$, let $\mathrm{Conv}_M^{\nu} \subset \mathrm{Conv}_M$ be equal to $\mathrm{Gr}_M \star \mathrm{Gr}_M^{\nu}$.

Note that for a point $(\mathcal{F}_M, \mathcal{F}'_M, \beta, \widetilde{\beta}') \in \mathrm{Conv}_M$, by taking the composition $\beta^1 := \widetilde{\beta}^1 \circ \beta$ we obtain a trivialization of $\mathcal{F}'_M$ on $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{c}$, and thus a map $\mathrm{Conv}_M \to \mathrm{Gr}_M \times \mathrm{Gr}_M$, which is easily seen to be an isomorphism. We will denote by p and p' the two projections $\mathrm{Conv}_M \to \mathrm{Gr}_M$, which remember the data of $(\mathcal{F}_M, \beta)$ and $(\mathcal{F}'_M, \beta')$, respectively. Note that the locally closed subsets Conv_M^{ν} introduced above are exactly the orbits of the diagonal $M((t))$ action on $\mathrm{Conv}_M \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_M \times \mathrm{Gr}_M$.

13.8. For another pair of coweights λ_1 and λ_2, consider the intersection

$$(\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^{\lambda_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^{\lambda_2})^{\nu} := (\mathrm{Gr}_{B(M)}^{\lambda_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^{\lambda_2}) \cap \mathrm{Conv}_M^{\nu}\,.$$

Again, up to isomorphism, the above variety depends only on the difference $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$. Let us denote by $\mathsf{D}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu}(\lambda)$ the set of irreducible components of the above intersection of the (maximal possible) dimension $\langle \nu + \lambda, \check{\rho} \rangle$.

We will define on the set $\mathsf{D}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu} := \underset{\lambda}{\cup} \mathsf{D}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\nu}(\lambda)$ two structures of a (ϕ-normal) $\mathfrak{m}$-crystal.

First, let us define the operations e_i, f_i. For that let us fix $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$ and consider the ind-scheme

$$(\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^{\lambda_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^{\lambda_2})^{\nu} := (\mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^{\lambda_1} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{B^-(M)}^{\lambda_2}) \cap \mathrm{Conv}_M^{\nu}$$

projecting by means of p onto $\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B^-(M)}$. As in Lemma 13.4, we obtain that there is an isomorphism

$$(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B^-(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)})^\nu \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B^-(M)} \times \big((g \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M\big)$$

for any $g \in \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B^-(M)}$.

For $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ and $g \in \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B^-(M)}$, let $\mathsf{B}^{\nu,*}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda)$ denote the set of irreducible components of the intersection $(g \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$ of (the maximal possible) dimension $\langle \nu + \lambda, \check{\rho}\rangle$. (As in Lemma 13.4, this set does not depend on the choice of $g \in \mathrm{Gr}_M$).

Thus, we have a set-theoretic decomposition

$$\mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda) \simeq \underset{\lambda'}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^{\nu,*}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda') \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda - \lambda').$$

By taking $M = M_i$, we define the operations e_i and f_i to act along the second multiple of this decomposition. It is easy to see that this definition agrees with the one of Sect. 13.3.

The operations e_i^*, f_i^* are defined in a similar fashion. We fix λ_1 and λ_2 and consider the ind-scheme

$$(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B(M)})^\nu := (\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$$

projecting by means of p' onto $\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B(M)}$. It also splits as a product

$$(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B(M)})^\nu \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B(M)} \times \big((\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times g) \cap \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M\big)$$

for any $g \in \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B(M)}$.

Let $\mathsf{B}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda)$ denote the set of irreducible components of (the maximal possible) dimension $\langle \nu + \lambda, \check{\rho}\rangle$ of $(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times g) \cap (\mathrm{Gr}_M \times \mathrm{Gr}_M)^\nu$, and as before, we obtain a set-theoretic decomposition

$$\mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda) \simeq \underset{\lambda'}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda') \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda - \lambda'). \tag{27}$$

We define the operations e_i^*, f_i^* to act along the second multiple of this decomposition for $M = M_i$, and again this definition is easily seen to coincide with the one of Sect. 13.5.

Note that by taking g to be the unit element in Gr_M, we obtain that $\mathsf{B}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda)$ are exactly the elements of the crystal associated to the integrable $\check{M}$-module with highest weight ν of weight λ. Set $\mathsf{B}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}} := \underset{\lambda}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda)$, and recall from [BG], that this set has a canonical structure of a (normal) $\mathfrak{m}$-crystal.

The following is a generalization of Theorem 3.2 of [BG], when one of the finite crystals is replaced by $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$:

Proposition 13.9. *In terms of the above set-theoretic decomposition $\mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}} \simeq \mathsf{B}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}} \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, the crystal structure on $\mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$, given by e_i and f_i, corresponds to the tensor product crystal structure on the right-hand side.*

We omit the proof, since the argument is completely analogous to the corresponding proof in *loc.cit.*

13.10. Finally, we are ready to define the decompositions of (23).

Consider the projection

$$(\mathfrak{q}_P \times \mathfrak{q}_{P^-}) : \mathrm{Gr}_P \underset{\mathrm{Gr}_G}{\times} \mathrm{Gr}_{P^-} \to \mathrm{Gr}_M \times \mathrm{Gr}_M \simeq \mathrm{Conv}_M\,.$$

This projection is $M((t))$-equivariant. For a fixed M-dominant coweight ν let us denote by $(\mathrm{Gr}_P \underset{\mathrm{Gr}_G}{\times} \mathrm{Gr}_{P^-})^\nu$ the preimage of Conv^ν_M under this map. For a point $g \in \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$ consider

the scheme $(\mathfrak{q}_P \times \mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(g) \subset (\mathrm{Gr}_P \underset{\mathrm{Gr}_G}{\times} \mathrm{Gr}_{P^-})^\nu$. The set of its irreducible components of (the maximal possible) dimension $\langle \nu, \check{\rho} \rangle$ will be denoted $\mathsf{C}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

Thus, we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \underset{\nu}{\cup} \mathsf{C}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}} \times \mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

Moreover, by unraveling the construction of the operations, we obtain that the above decomposition respects the action of both e_i, f_i, and e_i^*, f_i^*, such that all of the operations act via the second multiple (i.e. $\mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$) in the way specified above.

This defines the required decomposition in view of Proposition 13.9.

Finally, by combining what we said above with Theorem 12.8, (and assuming the highest weight property of the crystal $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$), we obtain that the set $\mathsf{C}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$, which enumerates irreducible components of $(\mathfrak{q}_P \times \mathfrak{q}_{P^-})^{-1}(g)$ for $g \in \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$, parametrizes a basis of $\mathrm{Hom}_M(V^\nu_M, U(\mathfrak{n}(\check{\mathfrak{p}})))$.

14. Crystals via quasi-maps' spaces

14.1. In this section $\mathfrak{g}$ will be again an arbitrary Kac-Moody algebra. Recall that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ denotes Kashiwara's flag scheme. We will fix $\mathbf{C}$ to be an arbitrary smooth (but not necessarily complete) curve, with a distinguished point $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$. As in the previous section, we will denote by t a local coordinate on $\mathbf{C}$ defined near $\mathbf{c}$.

Recall that for $\lambda \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ in Sect. 2.12 we introduced the scheme $\mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$ and its open subset $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$. We showed in Proposition 2.21 that when $\mathbf{C} = \mathbb{A}^1$, then $\mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$ can be identified with the scheme of based quasi-maps $\mathrm{QMaps}^\lambda(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}})$, such that $\mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$ corresponds to the locus of *maps* inside quasi-maps.

We have a natural projection $\varrho^\lambda_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathcal{Z}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathbf{C}^\lambda$, and we set $\mathfrak{F}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} := (\varrho^\lambda_{\mathfrak{b}})^{-1}(\lambda \cdot 0_{\mathbf{C}})$ (resp., $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} := \mathfrak{F}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{C})$).

It was shown in [FFKM] (cf. also [BFGM]) that when $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional, the scheme $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ can be identified with the intersection $\mathrm{Gr}^0_B \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{-\lambda}_{B^-}$ considered in the previous section. Thus, the contents of the previous section amount to defining a crystal structure on the union of the sets of irreducible components of the union of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ (over all $\lambda \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$).

For an arbitrary Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$ to be the set of irreducible components of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$, and set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} = \underset{\lambda}{\cup} \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$. In this section we will generalize the construction of the previous section to define on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ a structure of a crystal. However, since in the general case we do not have the affine Grassmannian picture, and we will have to spell out the definitions using quasi-maps' spaces.

To define the crystal structure on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ we will need to assume Conjecture 2.27. To identify it with standard crystal of [KaS], we will need to assume one more conjecture, Conjecture 15.3 (cf. Sect. 15). Both these conjectures are verified when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of affine (and, of course, finite) type, cf. Sect. 15.5 and Sect. 15.6.

14.2. For a standard parabolic $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, and an element $\theta \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, let $\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ (resp., $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$) denote the preimage of $\theta \cdot \mathbf{c}$ under $\varrho^\theta_{\mathfrak{b}} : \mathcal{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathbf{C}^\theta$ (resp., in $\widetilde{\mathcal{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$).

Assuming for a moment that $\mathbf{C}$ is complete (cf. the proof of Proposition 14.3, where we get rid of this assumption), recall the stacks $\mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$ (resp., $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$), introduced in

Sect. 2.32. Recall also the forgetful map $\mathrm{Gr}_M \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$, where Gr_M is $\mathrm{Gr}_{M,\mathbf{c}}$. We define now three ind-schemes

$$\mathbb{S}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} := \mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}^\theta}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}_M \times pt),\ \ \widetilde{\mathbb{S}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} := \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}^\theta}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}_M \times pt) \text{ and}$$

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} := \overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})\times\mathbf{C}^\theta}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}_M \times pt),$$

where we are using the projection $\mathfrak{q}_\mathfrak{p} : \mathsf{Z}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ (and similarly for $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C})$) to define the fiber product, and $pt \to \mathbf{C}^\theta$ corresponds to the point $\theta \cdot \mathbf{c}$. By definition, $\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \simeq \mathbb{S}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathrm{Gr}_M}{\times} pt$, where $pt \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_M$ is the unit point (and similarly for $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$).

Using the map $\varrho^\theta_M : \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}$, we can rewrite

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{S}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \simeq \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \underset{\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}}{\times} \mathrm{Conv}_M \text{ and } \overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{C}) \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathsf{Z}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathcal{H}_{M,\mathbf{C}}}{\times} \mathrm{Conv}_M\,.$$

Proposition 14.3. *There exists a canonical action of $M((t))$ on $\widetilde{\mathbb{S}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ (resp., $\mathbb{S}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$) compatible with its action on Conv_M (resp., Gr_M, Conv_M).*

Proof. We will give a proof for $\widetilde{\mathbb{S}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, since the corresponding facts for $\mathbb{S}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ are analogous (and simpler).

Let $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{c}$ (resp., $\mathcal{D}^*_\mathbf{c}$) be the formal (resp., formal punctured) disc in $\mathbf{C}$ around $\mathbf{c}$. Using Lemma 2.13, the data defining a point of $\widetilde{\mathbb{S}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ can be rewritten using the formal disc $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{c}$ instead of the curve $\mathbf{C}$ as follows:

It consists of a principal P-bundle $\mathcal{F}_P$ on $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{c}$, a principal M-bundle $\mathcal{F}_M$ on $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{c}$ with a trivialization $\beta : \mathcal{F}_M|_{\mathcal{D}^*_\mathbf{c}} \to \mathcal{F}^0_M|_{\mathcal{D}^*_\mathbf{c}}$ on the formal punctured disc $\mathcal{D}^*_\mathbf{c}$, and a collection of maps

$$\kappa^{\check\lambda} : (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M},$$

satisfying the Plücker equations, such that for $\check\lambda \in \check\Lambda^+_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ the composed map of line bundles

$$\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}_M}$$

has zero of order $\langle\theta, \check\lambda\rangle$ at $\mathbf{c}$.

(In particular, this description makes it clear that the schemes $\widetilde{\mathbb{S}}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ etc., do not depend on the global curve $\mathbf{C}$, but rather on the formal neighborhood $\mathcal{D}_\mathbf{c}$ of $\mathbf{c}$.)

In these terms, the action of $M((t))$ leaves the data of $(\mathcal{F}_P, \mathcal{F}_M, \kappa^{\check\lambda})$ intact, and only acts on the data of the trivialization β.

□

For $\nu \in \Lambda^+_\mathfrak{m}$, recall the subscheme $\mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M \subset \mathrm{Conv}_M$. Let us denote by $\mathbb{S}^\nu_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ the preimage of Conv^ν_M under the map ϱ^θ_M. The resulting map $\mathbb{S}^\nu_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$ will be denoted by ϱ^ν_M. From Proposition 14.3 we obtain the following:

Corollary 14.4. *The map $\varrho^\nu_M : \mathbb{S}^\nu_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$ is a fibration, locally trivial in the smooth topology.*

The proof is immediate from the fact that the $M((t))$-action on Conv^ν_M is transitive.

14.5. For $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, and θ being the projection of λ under $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}} \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, recall the subscheme $(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)})^\nu \subset \mathrm{Conv}_M$.

By unfolding the definitions of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$, we obtain an isomorphism:

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_M}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)}) \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_T}{\times} (t^{\lambda_1} \times t^{\lambda_2}). \tag{28}$$

(Here we denote by t^λ the point-scheme, identified with the reduced sub-scheme of the corresponding connected component of Gr_T.)

The isomorphism (28), combined with Conjecture 2.27 which we assume, implies the following dimension estimate:

Corollary 14.6. *The fibers of the projection $\varrho^\nu_M : \mathbb{S}^\nu_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$ are of dimension at most $\langle \nu, \check{\rho} - 2\check{\rho}_M \rangle$.*

Proof. Pick $\lambda^1 = \lambda = \nu$ and $\lambda^2 = 0$ so that $(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)}) \cap \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$ is non-empty, and is in fact of pure dimension $\langle \nu, 2\check{\rho}_M \rangle$. Therefore, it would suffice to show that $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_M}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)})$ is of dimension $\leq \langle \nu, \check{\rho} \rangle = \langle \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \check{\rho} \rangle$.

However, from Conjecture 2.27 (which we assume to hold for our $\mathfrak{g}$) we obtain that

$$\dim\Big(\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_M}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M)})\Big) = \dim\Big(\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_T}{\times} (t^{\lambda_1} \times t^{\lambda_2})\Big) = \dim\Big(\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}\Big) = \langle \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \check{\rho} \rangle$$

which implies the desired dimension estimate.

□

Since the stabilizers of the $M((t))$-action on Conv^ν_M are connected, we obtain that irreducible components of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\nu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with irreducible components of any fiber of $\varrho^\nu_M : \mathbb{S}^\nu_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathrm{Conv}^\nu_M$. Let us denote by $\mathsf{C}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$ the set of irreducible components of any such fiber of (the maximal possible) dimension $\langle \nu, \check{\rho} - 2\check{\rho}_M \rangle$.

Thus, our set $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$ can be identified with the set of irreducible components of the fibers of

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \to \mathrm{Conv}^\lambda_T = \bigcup_{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = \lambda} t^{\lambda_1} \times t^{\lambda_2}.$$

Using the isomorphism (28), we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \simeq \underset{\nu}{\cup} \mathsf{C}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}} \times \mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}, \tag{29}$$

where $\mathsf{D}^\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is as in the previous section.

This already allows to introduce the operations e_i, f_i, e_i^*, f_i^*. Indeed, by choosing $\mathfrak{m}$ to be the subminimal Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{m}_i$, we let our operations act along the second factor in the decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \simeq \underset{n}{\cup} \mathsf{C}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i} \times \mathsf{D}^n_{\mathfrak{m}_i},$$

as in Sect. 13.7. Moreover, the properties of (23) hold due to Proposition 13.9.

To be able to apply the uniqueness theorem of [KaS], it remains to do two things: to check that the operations e_i, f_i commute with e_j^*, f_j^* whenever $i \neq j$, and to establish the highest weight property of $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then the uniqueness theorem of *loc. cit.* would guarantee the isomorphism $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}} \simeq \mathsf{B}^\infty_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

14.7. The above definition of the operations e_i, etc. mimics the definition of Sect. 13.7. We will now give another (of course, equivalent) construction in the spirit of Sect. 13.3, which would enable us to prove the commutation relation.

Again, for a standard parabolic $\mathfrak{p}$, let us consider the ind-scheme $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}}$ equal to

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_M}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{0}_{B^-(M)}),$$

where θ is the image of μ under $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}} \to \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$.

In other words, $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}}$ classifies the data of

- A principal P-bundle $\mathcal{F}_P$ (as usual, the induced bundle will be denoted by $\mathcal{F}'_M$),
- Regular bundle maps $(\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}$, and
- Meromorphic maps $\mathcal{L}^{\check\nu}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\nu})_{\mathcal{F}'_M}$,

such that

- $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}'_M} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_P} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}$ are the identity maps, and
- the (a priori meromorphic) compositions $(\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}'_M} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}(\langle -\mu, \check\lambda\rangle \cdot \mathbf{c})$ are regular and surjective.

Using Proposition 14.3, we obtain that the natural projection

$$\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}} \to (\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{0}_{B^-(M)}) \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}$$

splits as a direct product, as in Lemma 13.4.

For another element $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}}$, consider the preimage (call it $\mathbb{S}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}}$) of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B(M)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)} \subset \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}$ in $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}}$. Using (28), we conclude that $\mathbb{S}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}}$ is isomorphic to a locally closed subset inside $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_T}{\times} (t^{\lambda} \times t^0)$.

Therefore, as in Sect. 13.3, we obtain that the fibers of $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{b}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B^-(M)}$ are of dimensions $\leq \langle \mu, \check\rho\rangle$, and if we denote by $\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m},*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)$ the set of irreducible components of any such fiber, we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) = \underset{\mu}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m},*}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{30}$$

Moreover, by unraveling our definition of the e_i's and f_i's we obtain that they act along the second multiple of the above decomposition when we choose $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_i$.

14.8. We will now perform a similar procedure for the e^*_i and f^*_i. Let $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}}$ be the ind-scheme equal to

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_M}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{0}_{B(M)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M)}).$$

In other words, $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}}$ classifies the data of

- A B-bundle $\mathcal{F}_B$, such that the induced T-bundle $\mathcal{F}_T$ is trivial,
- An M-bundle $\mathcal{F}_M$,
- Regular bundle maps $(\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_B} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M}$, and
- Meromorphic maps $(\mathcal{U}_{\check\nu})_{\mathcal{F}_M} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\nu}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}$,

such that

- The compositions $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_B} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}$ are the identity maps, and
- The $\kappa^{\check\lambda,-}_{\mathfrak{p}}$'s induce regular bundle maps $\mathcal{L}^{\check\lambda}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check\lambda})_{\mathcal{F}_M}(\langle \mu, \check\lambda\rangle \cdot \mathbf{c})$.

As above, we have a projection $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M)}$, which splits as a direct product and defines a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) = \underset{\mu}{\cup} \mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m}}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\lambda - \mu), \tag{31}$$

where $\mathsf{B}^{\mathfrak{m}}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)$ is the set of irreducible components of dimension $\langle \mu, \check{\rho} \rangle$ of any fiber of $\varrho^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{b},M}$.

And as before, the operations e_i^*, f_i^* introduced earlier coincide with those defined in terms of the above decomposition for $M = M_i$.

14.9. At last, we are ready to check the required commutation property of e_i and f_i with e_j^* and f_j^* for $i \neq j \in I$.

Consider the scheme $\mathbb{S}^{\mu_1,\mu_2}_{\mathfrak{g},i,j}$ classifying the data of

- A P_i-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{P_i}$ (with the induced M_i-bundle $\mathcal{F}'_{M_i}$),
- An M_j-bundle $\mathcal{F}_{M_j}$,
- Regular maps $(\mathcal{V}_{\check{\nu}})_{\mathcal{F}_{P_i}} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check{\nu}})_{\mathcal{F}_{M_j}}$,
- Meromorphic maps : $\mathcal{L}^{\check{\nu}}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check{\nu}})_{\mathcal{F}'_{M_i}}$, and
- Meromorphic maps $(\mathcal{U}_{\check{\nu}})_{\mathcal{F}_{M_j}} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check{\nu}}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}$,

such that

- The compositions $\mathcal{L}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}'_{M_i}} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{P_i}} \to (\mathcal{U}^{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{M_j}} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}$ are the identity maps,
- The (a priori meromorphic) compositions

  $$(\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}'_{M_i}} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{P_i}} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{M_j}} \to \mathcal{L}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}(-\langle \mu_1, \check{\lambda} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{c})$$

  are regular bundle maps, and
- The (a priori meromorphic) compositions

  $$\mathcal{L}^{\check{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}(-\langle \mu_2, \check{\lambda} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{c}) \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}'_{M_i}} \to (\mathcal{V}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{P_i}} \to (\mathcal{U}_{\check{\lambda}})_{\mathcal{F}_{M_j}}$$

  are regular bundle maps as well.

As before, we have a map

$$\mathbb{S}^{\mu_1,\mu_2}_{\mathfrak{g},i,j} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_1}_{B^-(M_i)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_2}_{B(M_j)}.$$

We claim that $\mathbb{S}^{\mu_1,\mu_2}_{\mathfrak{g},i,j}$ over $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_1}_{B^-(M_i)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_2}_{B(M_j)}$ also splits as a direct product. This follows from the fact that we can make the group $(N^-(M_i) \times N(M_j))((t))$ act on $\mathbb{S}^{\mu_1,\mu_2}_{\mathfrak{g},i,j}$ lifting its action on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_1}_{B^-(M_i)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_2}_{B(M_j)}$.

The isomorphism class of $\mathbb{S}^{\mathfrak{g},\mu_1,\mu_2}_{i,j}$ also depends only on the difference $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$, and let us denote by $\mathsf{C}_{i,j}(\mu)$ the set of irreducible components of the top dimension of any fiber of $\mathbb{S}^{\mathfrak{g},\mu_1,\mu_2}_{i,j}$ over $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_1}_{B^-(M_i)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_2}_{B(M_j)}$.

As before, the preimage of $(\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_1}_{B(M_i)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_1}_{B^-(M_i)}) \times (\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu_2}_{B(M_j)} \times \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda_2}_{B^-(M_j)})$ in $\mathbb{S}^{\mathfrak{g},\mu_1,\mu_2}_{i,j}$ is naturally a locally closed subset inside $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ and we obtain a decomposition

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) \simeq \underset{\mu_1,\mu_2}{\cup} \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_i}(\lambda_1 - \mu_1) \times \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{m}_j}(\mu_2 - \lambda_2) \times \mathsf{C}_{i,j}(\mu_1 - \mu_2). \tag{32}$$

Moreover, this decomposition refines those of (30) and (31). Hence, the e_i, f_i, e_j^*, f_j^* operations preserve the decomposition of (32), and e_i, f_i act along the first factor, whereas e_j^*, f_j^* act only along the second factor, and hence, they commute.

15. The highest weight property

In this section (with the exception of Sect. 15.5 and Sect. 15.6), $\mathfrak{g}$ will still be a general Kac-Moody algebra. We will reduce Conjecture 2.27 to Conjecture 15.3, and verify the latter in the finite and affine cases.

15.1. Observe that for any $i \in I$, using (3), by adding a defect at $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}$, we can realize $\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$ as a closed subscheme of $\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$ of codimension 2. Similarly, $\mathfrak{F}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ is a closed subscheme of $\mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$.

Let $\mathbf{K}$ be an irreducible component of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$, and let $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$ be its closure in $\mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$. Consider the intersection

$$\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Proposition 15.2. *If the above intersection is non-empty, it consists of one irreducible component, whose dimension is* $\dim(\mathbf{K}) - 1$.

Proof. (of Proposition 15.2.)

Recall the stack $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ introduced in the previous section. Let $\mathbb{S}^{\mu,\leq\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ and $\mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ be its closed (resp., locally closed) subschemes equal to

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}_i} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_{M_i}}{\times} \left(\mathrm{Gr}^0_{B(M_i)} \times (\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)})\right), \overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}_i} \underset{\mathrm{Conv}_{M_i}}{\times} \left(\mathrm{Gr}^0_{B(M_i)} \times (\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)})\right),$$

respectively, where $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)}$ is the closure of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)}$ in Gr_{M_i}. (In other words, we impose the condition that the maps $(\mathcal{U}^{\nu})_{\mathcal{F}_{M_i}} \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}^0_T}(\langle\lambda,\nu\rangle\cdot\mathbf{c})$ are regular (resp., regular bundle maps).)

We have $\mathbb{S}^{\mu,\leq\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i} = \bigcup_{0\leq\lambda'\leq\lambda} \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$, and $\mathbb{S}^{\mu,\leq\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ identifies naturally with a locally closed subset of $\mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ (of the same dimension), and

$$\mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \simeq \bigcup_{\mu} \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\leq\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}, \quad \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \simeq \bigcup_{\mu} \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}.$$

We have a pair of Cartesian squares:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\leq\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} & \overset{\overline{\tau}_{\alpha_i}}{\longleftarrow} & \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}.
\end{array}$$

Therefore, it is enough to show that for any irreducible component $\mathbf{K}$ of $\mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$, the intersection

$$\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$$

consists of one irreducible component, whose dimension is $\dim(\mathbf{K}) - 1$.

However, since $\mathbb{S}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)}$ splits as a product, our assertion follows from the fact that $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)}$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{B^-(M_i)}$ are irreducible varieties, since M_i is a reductive group of rank 1.

□

In order to be able to apply the uniqueness theorem of [KaS], we need the following conjecture to be satisfied for our $\mathfrak{g}$:

Conjecture 15.3. *If $\lambda \neq 0$, for every irreducible component $\mathbf{K}$ of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$, the intersection $\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ is non-empty for at least one $i \in I$.*

Note that Conjecture 15.3 implies Conjecture 2.27:

Proof. We will argue by induction on the length of λ. The dimension estimate is obvious for $\lambda = 0$, and let us suppose that it is verified for all $\lambda' < \lambda$.

Let $\mathbf{K}$ be an irreducible component of $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$, and let $i \in I$ be such that $\mathbf{K}' := \overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ is non-empty.

We know that $\dim(\mathbf{K}') \leq \langle \lambda - \alpha_i, \check{\rho} \rangle$. Hence, by Proposition 15.2, $\dim(\mathbf{K}) \leq \langle \lambda, \check{\rho} \rangle$, which is what we had to prove. □

Note also that if we assume Conjecture 15.3, and thus obtain a well-defined crystal structure on $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, the operation

$$\mathbf{K} \mapsto \overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}},$$

as in Proposition 15.2, viewed as a map $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) \to \mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda - \alpha_i) \cup 0$, equals f_i^*.

Hence, if Conjecture 15.3 is verified, we obtain, according to Sect. 12.5, that our crystal $\mathsf{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ can be identified with Kashiwara's crystal $\mathsf{B}^{\infty}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.

In particular, we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 15.4. *If Conjecture 15.3 is verified, then for a parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ such that its Levi is of finite type, the dimension of the fibers of the map $\mathbb{S}^{\nu}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \to \mathrm{Conv}^{\nu}_M$ is $\leq \langle \nu, \check{\rho} - 2\check{\rho}_M \rangle$, and the set of irreducible components of dimension $\langle \nu, \check{\rho} - 2\check{\rho}_M \rangle$ of (any) such fiber parametrizes a basis of the space* $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{m}}(V^{\mu}_M, U(n(\check{\mathfrak{p}})))$.

15.5. Although Conjecture 15.3 is well-known for $\mathfrak{g}$ of finite type, we will give here yet another proof, using Theorem 11.6. Then we will modify this argument to prove Conjecture 15.3 in the affine case.

We will argue by contradiction. Let λ be a minimal element in $\Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, for which there exists a component $\mathbf{K}$ such that all $\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ are empty. As in the proof of Conjecture 2.27 above, we obtain in particular that for all $\lambda' < \lambda$, the dimension estimate $\dim(\mathfrak{F}^{\lambda'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}) = |\lambda'|$ holds.

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a genus 0 curve. According to [BFGM], we have a smooth map $\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C}) \to \overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C})$, and let $\partial(\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C}))$ be the preimage of $\partial(\overline{\mathrm{Bun}}_B(\mathbf{C}))$ in $\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$. According to Theorem 11.6, $\partial(\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C}))$ is a quasi-effective Cartier divisor in $\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$. Let us consider the intersection $\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \partial(\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C}))$. This intersection is non-empty, since it contains the point-scheme, corresponding to $\mathcal{Z}^{0}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathfrak{F}^{0}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})$.

On the one hand, from Lemma 11.3, we obtain that $\dim(\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \partial(\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g}})) \geq \dim(\mathbf{K}) - 1 \geq |\lambda| - 1$. On the other hand, this intersection is contained in

$$\underset{\lambda' < \lambda}{\cap} \overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \mathfrak{F}^{\lambda'}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}.$$

But, according to our assumption, all the λ' appearing in the above expression have the property that $|\lambda'| \leq |\lambda| - 2$, and hence $\dim(\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \partial(\mathcal{Z}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{C})))$ is of dimension $\leq |\lambda| - 2$, which is a contradiction.

15.6. In this subsection we will prove Conjecture 15.3 for affine Lie algebras. We will change our notation, and from now on $\mathfrak{g}$ will denote a finite-dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra, and $\mathfrak{g}_{aff}$ will be the corresponding affine Kac-Moody algebra.

As above, we will argue by contradiction. Let μ be a minimal element of $\widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$, for which there exists a component $\mathbf{K}$ violating Conjecture 15.3. In particular, we can assume that the dimension estimate $\dim(\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda'}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}}) = |\lambda'|$ holds for all $\lambda' < \lambda$.

Let us consider the corresponding Uhlenbeck space $\mathfrak{U}^{\lambda}_{G;B}$. We can view our component $\mathbf{K}$ as a subset in $\mathrm{Bun}^{\lambda}_{G;B}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\infty; \mathbf{D}_0)$, and let $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{K}}}$ be the closure of $\mathbf{K}$ inside $\mathfrak{U}^{\lambda}_{G;B}$.

Consider the intersection $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{K}}} \cap \partial(\mathfrak{U}^{\lambda}_{G;B})$. As before, it is non-empty, since it contains the point $a \cdot \mathbf{c} \in \mathfrak{U}^{\mu;\mu,0}_{G,B} \subset \mathfrak{U}^{\lambda}_{G;B}$, and hence is of dimension at least $|\lambda| - 1$. On the other hand we will show that if $\mathbf{K}$ violates Conjecture 15.3, this intersection will be of dimension $\leq |\lambda| - 2$.

Indeed, consider the fiber of $\varrho^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}} : \mathfrak{U}^{\lambda}_{G;B} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\lambda}$ over $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\lambda}$. According to Theorem 10.2, it is the union over decompositions $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + b \cdot \delta$ of varieties

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda_1}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}}),$$

and $\partial(\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{U}}{}^{\lambda}_{G;B})$ corresponds to the locus where $\lambda_2 \neq 0$. Since $|\delta|$ is the dual Coxeter number, and is > 1, the intersection

$$\overline{\overline{\mathbf{K}}} \cap (\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda_1}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}} \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})) \tag{33}$$

is of dimension $\leq |\lambda| - 2$ unless $b = 0$ and $|\lambda_1| = |\lambda| - 1$.

However, under the projection $\mathfrak{U}^{\mu}_{G;B} \to \mathcal{Z}^{\mu}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}}(\mathbf{C})$, the intersection (33) gets mapped to $\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda_1}_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{b}^+_{aff}}$, and by assumption the latter is empty for $\lambda_1 = \lambda - \alpha_i$ for all $i \in I_{aff}$.

This completes the proof of Conjecture 15.3 for untwisted affine Lie algebras. The proof for a twisted affine Lie algebra follows by realizing it (as well as all the related moduli spaces) as the fixed-point set of a finite order automorphism of the corresponding untwisted affine Lie algebra. We will not use the result for the twisted affine Lie algebras, and we leave the details to the interested reader.

Part V: Computation of the IC sheaf.

16. IC stalks: statements

16.1. The purpose of this section is to formulate some statements about the behavior of the IC-sheaves on the parabolic Uhlenbeck spaces $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G,P}$ and $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G,P}$. Since the material here is largely parallel to that of [BFGM], we will assume that the reader is familiar with the notation of *loc.cit.*

Recall that we have a natural map

$$\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$$

and the decompositions into locally closed subschemes

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P} = \bigcup_{\theta_2,b} \mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} = \bigcup_{\theta_2,b} \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} = \mathfrak{r}^{-1}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}(\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P})$. Recall also that we have the natural sections

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta} \to \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}} \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}.$$

16.2. For a standard parabolic $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, consider the corresponding parabolic $\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{aff}$, and let $\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be the unipotent radical of the parabolic attached to it in the Langlands dual Lie algebra $\check{\mathfrak{g}}_{aff}$. (Recall that by $\mathfrak{V}$ we denote $\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}$.)

The corresponding Levi contains the subgroup $\check{M}_{aff} \simeq \check{M} \times \mathbb{G}_m$ (we ignore the other $\mathbb{G}_m$-factor because it is central), and consider $\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ as a $\check{M}_{aff}$-module. Note that the lattice $\widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ is naturally the lattice of central characters of $\check{M}_{aff}$, and $\widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \subset \widehat{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ corresponds to those that appear in $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}})$.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff}}$ the canonical equivalence of categories between $\mathrm{Rep}(\check{M}_{aff})$ and the category of spherical perverse sheaves on the affine Grassmannian of M_{aff}. More generally, for a scheme (or stack S) mapping to $\mathrm{Bun}_{M_{aff}}$, we will denote by $\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff}}_{S,\mathbf{C}}$ the corresponding functor from $\mathrm{Rep}(\check{M}_{aff})$ to the category of perverse sheaves on $S \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_{M_{aff}}}{\times} \mathcal{H}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$, cf. [BFGM], Theorem 1.12.

For an element $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ we will denote by $\mathfrak{P}(\theta)$ elements of the set of partitions of θ as a sum $\theta = \sum\limits_k n_k \cdot \theta_k$, $\theta_k \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$; let $|\mathfrak{P}(\theta)|$ be the sum $\sum\limits_k n_k$. For a partition $\mathfrak{P}(\theta)$, let $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$ denote the corresponding partially symmetrized power of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}) := \prod_k \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_k}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta),+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$ be the appropriate version of the Hecke stack over $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$.

Recall (cf. Sect. 4.1 of [BFGM]), we have a natural finite map

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Norm}}_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)} : \mathcal{H}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta),+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \to \mathcal{H}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}},$$

covering the map $\mathrm{Norm}_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)} : \mathbf{C}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)} \to \mathbf{C}^{\theta}$.

As in [BFGM], Theorem 1.12, we have the functor $\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff},\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}_{S,\mathbf{C}}$ from $\mathrm{Rep}(\check{M}_{aff})$ to the category of perverse sheaves on $S \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_{M_{aff}}}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta),+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$.

Theorem 16.3. *The object* $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})^!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}})$ *is isomorphic to the direct sum over all* $\mathfrak{P}(\theta)$ *of*

$$(\widetilde{\mathrm{Norm}}_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)})_* \left(\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff},\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}_{pt,\mathbf{C}}(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}})\right)[-|\mathfrak{P}(\theta)|],$$

where $pt \to \mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})$ *is the map corresponding to the trivial bundle.*

16.4. Next we will state the theorem that describes the stalks of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$.

Let $\theta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$ be decomposed as $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2 + b \cdot \delta$, and recall that the corresponding stratum $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$ is isomorphic to

$$\left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_{\infty}; \mathbf{D}'_0) \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\right) \times \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}).$$

Let us fix partitions $\mathfrak{P}(b)$ and $\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)$ of b and θ_2, respectively. Let $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ be the open subsets obtained by removing all the

diagonals. Let us denote by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ the corresponding locally closed subvariety in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$. Note that it is isomorphic to

$$\left(\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}',\mathbf{D}'_\infty;\mathbf{D}'_0)\underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C},\infty_{\mathbf{C}})}{\times}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\underset{\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}(\mathbf{C})}{\times}\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})\right)\right)\times\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}).$$

Theorem 16.5. *The *-restriction of* $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ *to the stratum* $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ *is isomorphic to*

$$\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff},\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}_{\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty;\mathbf{D}_0),\mathbf{C}}\left(\underset{i\geq 0}{\oplus}\,\mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}})[2i]\right)\boxtimes\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\mathfrak{V}^f)\otimes\mathrm{IC}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})}\right).$$

16.6. We will now formulate theorems parallel to Theorem 16.3 and Theorem 16.5 for the schemes $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$.

Let V be a representation of the group $\check{M}_{aff}$, and let $\mathfrak{P}(\theta):\theta=\sum\limits_k n_k\cdot\theta_k$ be a partition. We will denote by $\overline{\mathrm{Loc}}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(V)$ the semi-simple complex of sheaves on $\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(\mathbf{C})$ equal to the IC-sheaf tensored by the complex of vector spaces equal to

$$\bigotimes_k\left(V^f_{\theta_k}\right)^{\otimes n_k},$$

where V^f denotes the kernel of the principal nilpotent element $f\in\check{\mathfrak{m}}$ acting on V^f endowed with a principal grading, which we declare cohomological.

Note that the same procedure makes sense when V is actually a semi-simple complex of $\check{M}_{aff}$-representations.

Theorem 16.7. *The object* $(\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}})$ *is isomorphic to the direct sum over all* $\mathfrak{P}(\theta)$ *of*

$$(\mathrm{Norm}_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)})_*(\overline{\mathrm{Loc}}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}}))[|\mathfrak{P}(\theta)|].$$

And finally, we have:

Theorem 16.8. *The *-restriction of* $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ *to the stratum*

$$\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}\simeq\mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty;\mathbf{D}_0)\times\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})\times\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$$

is isomorphic to

$$\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{D}_\infty;\mathbf{D}_0)}\,\overline{\boxtimes}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)}\left(\underset{i\geq 0}{\oplus}\,\mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}})[2i]\right)\boxtimes\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\mathfrak{V}^f)\otimes\mathrm{IC}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})}\right).$$

Corollary 16.9. *Theorem 7.10 holds.*

To prove Corollary 16.9 it is enough to note that it is a particular case of Theorem 16.8 when $P=G$.

17. IC stalks: proofs

17.1. **Logic of the proof.** To prove all the 5 theorems, i.e. Theorem 16.3, Theorem 16.5, Theorem 16.7, Theorem 16.8 and Theorem 7.10 we will proceed by induction on the length $|\theta|$ of the parameter θ.

Thus, let θ be $(\overline{\theta},a)$, and we assume that the assertions of Theorem 16.3, Theorem 16.5, Theorem 16.7 and Theorem 16.8 hold for all $\theta'<\theta$ and that the assertion of Theorem 7.10 holds for all $a'<a$.

As we shall see, the induction hypothesis will give a description of the restrictions of $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ and (resp., $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$) on almost all the strata $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}}$ (resp., $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}}$).

This will allow us to perform the induction step and prove Theorem 16.3 for the parameter equal to θ. Then we will deduce Theorem 16.5, Theorem 16.7 and Theorem 16.8 from Theorem 16.3. Finally, as was noted before, Theorem 7.10 is a particular case of Theorem 16.8.

17.2. Consider a decomposition $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2 + b \cdot \delta$, and let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ be the corresponding stratum. We claim that if

$$\Big((\theta_2 < \theta) \bigwedge (b < a)\Big) \bigvee (|\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)| > 1) \bigvee (|\mathfrak{P}(b)| > 1)$$

then the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to this stratum is known and given by the expression of Theorem 16.5, by the induction hypothesis.

We will first establish the required isomorphism locally in the étale topology on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ and then argue that it holds globally. An absolutely similar argument establishes the description of the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to the corresponding stratum in $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ under the same assumption on $\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2), \mathfrak{P}(b)$.

We claim that every geometric point belonging to the stratum $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ has an étale neighborhood, which is smoothly equivalent to an étale neighborhood of a point in $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta';\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$, where $\theta' < \theta$.

Let us first consider the case when $\theta_1 \neq 0$.

Recall the map $\varrho^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P} \to \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}$ and the map $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}$.

Using Proposition 10.6, let us write a point σ of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$ as a triple

$$\left(\sigma', D^{\theta_2}, (\mathcal{F}_{M_{aff}}, \beta), (\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i)\right),$$

where:

- σ' is a based map of degree $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Bun}_{G;P}(\mathbf{X}, \infty_{\mathbf{X}}; 0_{\mathbf{X}})$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{F}'_G$ the corresponding principal G-bundle on $\mathbf{S}'$, endowed with a trivialization along $\mathbf{D}'_\infty$ and a reduction to P along $\mathbf{D}'_0$; let $\mathcal{F}'_M$ denote the corresponding M-bundle on $\mathbf{D}'_0 \simeq \mathbf{C}$.
- D^{θ_2} is an element of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta_2}$.
- $(\mathcal{F}'_M, D^{\theta_2}, \mathcal{F}_{M_{aff}}, \beta)$ is a point of $\mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$.
- $\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i$ is a 0-cycle of degree b on $\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$.

Assume for a moment that the support of the divisor $\varrho^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}(\sigma') \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^{\theta}$ is disjoint from both $\pi_v(\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i)$ and D^{θ_2}. Then, according to the factorization property Proposition 9.4, our point of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$ is smoothly equivalent to a point in the product $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta-\theta_1;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \times \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta_1;0,0}_{G;P}$, and our assertion about smooth equivalence follows since $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta_1;0,0}_{G;P} \simeq \mathrm{Bun}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}(\mathbf{S};, \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ and the latter is smooth.

It remains to analyze the case when the support of $\varrho^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}(\sigma')$ does intersect the supports of D^{θ_2} and $\pi_v(\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i)$. By applying again Proposition 9.4, we can assume that there exists a point $\mathbf{c} \in \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$, such that $D^{\theta_2} = \theta_2 \cdot \mathbf{c}$ and $\pi_v(\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i) = b \cdot \mathbf{c}$.

Consider the fiber product

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} \times \mathrm{Bun}^{a_1}_{G}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)\right) \underset{\mathbf{X}^{(a)} \times \mathbf{X}^{(a_1)}}{\times} \left(\mathbf{X}^{(a)} \times (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a_1)}\right)_{disj},$$

which, according to Proposition 9.9, maps smoothly to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta+a_1\cdot\delta}_{G;P}$.

We can view this morphism as a convolution of a point $\sigma \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ with a point $\sigma_1 \in \mathrm{Bun}^{a_1}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$ such that $\varpi_v(\sigma)$ and $\varpi_v(\sigma_1)$ have disjoint supports. We will denote the resulting point of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta+a_1\cdot\delta}_{G;P}$ by $\sigma \circ \sigma_1$.

It is easy to see that if $\sigma \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$, then $\sigma \circ \sigma_1 \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta+a_1\cdot\delta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P}$; moreover, $\sigma \circ \sigma_1$ corresponds to the triple

$$\left(\sigma' \circ \sigma_1, D^{\theta_2}, (\mathcal{F}_{M_{aff}}, \beta), (\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i)\right),$$

where all but the first piece of data remain unchanged.

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that there exists an integer a_1 large enough and $\sigma_1 \in \mathrm{Bun}^{a_1}_G(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty)$, such that the support of $\varrho^{\theta_1+a_1\cdot\delta}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}(\sigma \circ \sigma_1)$ is disjoint from $\mathbf{c}$. The latter means that the G-bundle obtained from $\sigma' \circ \sigma_1$ on the line $\mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{X}$ should be trivial and its reduction to P at $\mathbf{c} \times 0_{\mathbf{X}}$ in the generic position with respect to the trivialization at $\mathbf{c} \times \infty_{\mathbf{X}}$.

We can view σ_1 as a pair consisting of a divisor $D \in (\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a_1)}$ and a based map $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$. Then the restriction of $\sigma \circ \sigma_1$ to $\mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{X}$ is obtained from the restriction of σ to $\mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{X}$ by a Hecke transformation corresponding to the value of the above map $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$ at $\mathbf{c}$.

Now, it is clear that by choosing a_1 to be large enough we can always find a based map $\mathbf{C} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{BD,a_1}_{G,\mathbf{X},D}$ which would bring $\sigma'|_{\mathbf{c}\times\mathbf{X}}$ to the desired generic position.

17.3. Now, let us assume that $\theta_1 = 0$, but $(0 < \theta_2 < \theta) \bigwedge (0 < b)$. Write θ_2 as $(\overline{\theta}_2, b_2)$ and let us consider separately the cases $b_2 \neq 0$ and $b_2 = 0$.

If $b_2 \neq 0$, the assertion about the smooth equivalence follows from Proposition 9.9.

If $b_2 = 0$, the composition $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta_2,b}_{G;P} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P} \to \mathfrak{U}^a_G \overset{\varpi^a_h}{\to} \mathbf{X}^{(a)}$ maps to $(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(a)}$, and the assertion once again follows from Proposition 9.9.

Thus, it remains to analyze the cases when either $\theta_2 = \theta$, but $|\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)| > 1$ or $b \cdot \delta = \theta$, but $|\mathfrak{P}(b)| > 1$.

In the former case the assertion about the smooth equivalence follows immediately from Proposition 9.4. In the latter case, given a point

$$(\Sigma b_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i) \in \mathrm{Sym}^b(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \simeq \widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{b\cdot\delta;0,b}_{G;P},$$

which belongs to the stratum $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ with $|\mathfrak{P}(b)| > 1$, its projection with respect to at least one of the projections ϖ^b_h or ϖ^b_v will be a divisor supported in more than one point. I.e., we deduce the smooth equivalence assertion from either Proposition 9.9 or Proposition 9.4.

To summarize, we obtain that there are only two types of strata not covered by the induction hypothesis. One is when $\theta_2 = \theta$, and the corresponding stratum is isomorphic to $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}$, which is contained in the image of $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$. The restriction is locally constant, because of the equivariance with respect to the group $\mathbb{A}_1$ action on the pair $(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_0)$ by "horizontal" shifts (i.e., along the $\mathbf{C}$-factor).

The other type of strata occurs only when $\theta = a \cdot \delta$; the stratum itself is isomorphic to $\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, and it is contained in an open subset of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ that projects isomorphically onto an open subset of $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, via Proposition 9.9.

Note that the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to this last stratum is automatically locally constant. Indeed, it is enough to show that $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}|_{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}}$ is locally constant, but this follows from the fact that $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}$ is equivariant with respect to the group of affine-linear transformations acting on $\mathbf{S}$.

Thus, we have established that the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}$ to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ locally has the required form.

Let us show now that the isomorphism in fact holds globally. First of all, we claim that the complex $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}|_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}}$ is semi-simple. This follows from the fact, that by retracing our calculation in the category of mixed Hodge modules, we obtain that $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}|_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}}$ is pure. Hence, the semi-simplicity assertion follows from the decomposition theorem.

Therefore, it remains to see that the cohomologically shifted perverse sheaves that appear as direct summands in Theorem 16.5 have no monodromy. This is shown in the same way as the corresponding assertion in [BFGM], Sect. 5.11.

17.4. **The induction step.** We will now perform the induction step and prove Theorem 16.3 for the value of the parameter equal to θ. The proof essentially mimics the argument of [BFGM], Sect. 5.

Recall the map $\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}}:\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}\to \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$, and its section $\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}:\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}\to\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$. Recall also (cf. Corollary 10.4 and Proposition 10.6) that we have the "new" $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ that contracts it onto the image of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$.

Under these circumstances, we have as in [BFGM], Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 5.3:

Lemma 17.5. *There is a canonical isomorphism*

$$(\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})^!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}})\simeq(\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}})_!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}),$$

and $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})^!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}})$ *is a semi-simple complex.*

By the induction hypothesis and the factorization property, we may assume that the restriction of $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})^!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}})$ to the open subset in $\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$ equal to the preimage of the complement of the main diagonal $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}{}^\theta-\Delta(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}})$ has the desired form. I.e.,

$$(\widetilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}})^!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}})\simeq\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta),|\mathfrak{P}(\theta)|>1}(\widetilde{\mathrm{Norm}}_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)})_*\left(\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff},\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}_{pt,\mathbf{C}}(\mathfrak{V}_\mathfrak{p})\right)[-|\mathfrak{P}(\theta)|]\bigotimes\mathcal{K}^\theta,$$

where $\mathcal{K}^\theta$ is a semi-simple complex on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}\subset\mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$, and our goal is to show that

$$\mathcal{K}^\theta\simeq\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff}}_{pt,\mathbf{C}}\left((\mathfrak{V}_\mathfrak{p})_\theta\right)[-1], \tag{34}$$

where the subscript θ means that we are taking the direct summand of $\mathfrak{V}_\mathfrak{p}$ corresponding to the central character θ.

We pick a point in $\mathbf{C}$ that we will call $\mathbf{c}$, and consider the fiber of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$ over it, which we denote by ${}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P}$. By definition, we have a projection

$$\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}}:{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P}\to\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}.$$

As in [BFGM], Sect. 5.12, it is sufficient to prove that $(\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}})_!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}|_{{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P}})$ is concentrated in the (perverse) cohomomological degrees ≤ 0 and that its 0-th cohomology is isomorphic to

$$\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff}}\left((U(\mathfrak{V}_\mathfrak{p}))_\theta\right).$$

17.6. We calculate $(\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}})_!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}|_{{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P}})$ by intersecting ${}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P}$ with the various strata $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}$.

Case 1: The open stratum. Set $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{G;P} = {}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P} \cap \mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_0; \mathbf{D}_\infty)$. (Of course, $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{G;P} \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{\mathfrak{g}_{aff},\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$, in the terminology of Part IV.) The projection of the latter scheme onto $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$ was studied in Sect. 15.

For an M_{aff}-dominant coweight ν, let $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\nu_{G;P}$ denote the preimage in $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{G;P}$ of $\mathrm{Gr}^\nu_{M_{aff}}$, and we know from Corollary 15.4 that $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\nu_{G;P}$ is of dimension $\leq \langle \nu, \check{\rho}_{aff}\rangle$. Hence,

$$(\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}})_!(\underline{\mathbb{C}}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\nu_{G;P}})$$

lies in the cohomological degrees $\leq \langle \theta, 2(\check{\rho}_{aff} - \check{\rho}_{M_{aff}})\rangle$. Moreover, by Corollary 15.4 its top (i.e., $\langle \theta, 2(\check{\rho}_{aff} - \check{\rho}_{M_{aff}})\rangle$) perverse cohomology is isomorphic to

$$\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{Gr}^\nu_{M_{aff}}} \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\check{M}_{aff}}(V^\nu_{M_{aff}}, U(\mathfrak{n}(\check{\mathfrak{p}})).$$

Since, $\mathrm{Bun}^\theta_{G;P}(\mathbf{S}', \mathbf{D}'_\infty; \mathbf{D}'_0)$ is smooth of dimension $\langle \theta, 2(\check{\rho}_{aff} - \check{\rho}_{M_{aff}})\rangle$, we obtain that $(\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}})_!(\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}|_{\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^\theta_{G;P}})$ indeed lies in the cohomological degrees ≤ 0, and its 0-th perverse cohomology is $\mathrm{Loc}(U(\mathfrak{n}(\check{\mathfrak{p}}))_\theta)$.

Next, we will show that all other strata do not contribute to the cohomological degrees ≥ 0.

Case 2: The intermediate strata, when $\theta_2 \neq \theta$, $b \cdot \delta \neq \theta$.

Note that if the intersection of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2),\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ with ${}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P}$ is non-empty, then necessarily $|\mathfrak{P}(\theta_2)| = 1$. In this case, we will denote this intersection by $\mathfrak{F}^{\theta;\theta_2,\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$. As a scheme it is isomorphic to

$$(\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M(\mathbf{C})}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}}) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}}).$$

Note also that

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \underset{\mathrm{Bun}_M}{\times} \mathcal{H}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}} \simeq \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \underset{\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}}}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}} \star \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}}),$$

where $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}} \star \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}} \subset \mathrm{Conv}_{M_{aff}}$ is the corresponding subscheme in the convolution diagram, cf. Sect. 13.7. We shall view $\mathfrak{F}^{\theta;\theta_2,\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$ as a fibration over $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \times \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}})$ with the typical fiber $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}}$.

In terms of the above identifications, the projection $\varrho^\theta_{M_{aff}} : {}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^\theta_{G;P} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_M$ is equal to the composition

$$\left(\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P} \underset{\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}}}{\times} (\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}} \star \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}})\right) \times \overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}} - 0_{\mathbf{X}}) \to$$
$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}} \star \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1+\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}},$$

where the latter map is induced by the central cocharacter $b \cdot \delta$.

Now, using the assumption that $\theta_2 \neq \theta$ and $b \cdot \delta \neq \theta$, we can use Sect. 17.2 to write down the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^\theta_{G;P}}$ to $\mathfrak{F}^{\theta;\theta_2,\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}$.

We obtain that it is equal to the external product of the complex

$$\left(\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}}{\mathbb{C}}[\langle\theta_1, 2(\check{\rho}_{aff}-\check{\rho}_{M_{aff}})\rangle]\right)\boxtimes\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\mathfrak{V}^f)[2|\mathfrak{P}(b)|]\otimes\underset{\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})}{\mathbb{C}}\right)$$

along the base $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\theta_1}_{G;P}\times\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})$, and the perverse complex

$$\mathrm{Loc}^{M_{aff}}\left(\underset{i\geq 0}{\oplus}(\mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}}))_{\theta_2}[2i]\right)$$

along the fiber $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}}$.

By Corollary 15.4, we obtain that the !-direct image of the restriction $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}|_{\mathfrak{F}^{\theta;\theta_2,\mathfrak{P}(b)}_{G;P}}$ onto $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_1,+}_{M_{aff}}\star\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta_2,+}_{M_{aff}}$ is a complex of sheaves lying in strictly negative cohomological degrees with spherical perverse cohomology. By the exactness of convolution, its further direct image onto $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$ also lies in strictly negative cohomological degrees, which is what we had to show.

Case 3: The strata with $\theta = b\cdot\delta$.

The intersection $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{b\cdot\delta;0,b}_{G;P}\cap{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ is isomorphic to $(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})^{(b)}$, which we further subdivide according to partitions $\mathfrak{P}(b)$ of b. The map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{b\cdot\delta;0,b}_{G;P}\cap{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^{\theta}_{G;P}\to\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$ is the composition of the projection $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{b\cdot\delta;0,b}_{G;P}\cap{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^{\theta}_{G;P}\to pt$ and the embedding $pt\to\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$ corresponding to the central cocharacter $b\cdot\delta$.

We will consider separately two cases: (a) when $|\mathfrak{P}(b)|>1$ and (b) when $|\mathfrak{P}(b)|=1$.

In case (a), the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to the corresponding stratum $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$ is known, according to Sect. 17.3. In particular, we know that this complex lives in the perverse cohomological degrees $\leq -|\mathfrak{P}(b)|$. Hence, when we further restrict it to $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})\subset\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}})$, it lives in the perverse cohomological degrees $\leq -2|\mathfrak{P}(b)|<-1-|\mathfrak{P}(b)|$. Therefore, when we take its direct image along $\overset{\circ}{\mathrm{Sym}}{}^{\mathfrak{P}(b)}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}-0_{\mathbf{X}})$ we obtain a complex in the cohomological degrees <0.

In case (b), by the definition of intersection cohomology, the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to $\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ lives in strictly negative cohomological degrees. According to Sect. 17.3, this restriction is locally constant; therefore its further restriction to $\mathbf{X}-0_{\mathbf{X}}\subset\overset{\circ\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$ lives in the cohomological degrees <-1. Hence, its cohomology along $\mathbf{X}-0_{\mathbf{X}}$ lives in the cohomological degrees <0.

Case 4: The stratum $\theta_2=\theta$.

According to Proposition 10.2, the intersection $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\theta,0}_{G;P}\cap{}^{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{F}^{\theta}_{G;P}$ is in fact isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$, such that the map $\varrho^{\theta}_{M_{aff}}$ is the identity map.

Hence, the required assertion follows from the fact that the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff}}$ lives in the negative cohomological degrees, by the definition of the IC sheaf.

17.7. Thus, the induction step has been performed and we have established Theorem 16.3 for the parameter equal to θ. Now Theorem 16.7 is deduced from Theorem 16.3 is the same way as Theorem 7.2 of [BFGM] is deduced from Theorem 4.5 of *loc. cit.*

Let us prove now Theorem 16.8. As was explained in Sect. 17.2, it remains to identify the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G;P}}$ to strata of two types.

Type 1: $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta),0}_{G;P}$, where $\mathfrak{P}(\theta)$ is a 1-element partition.

Note that $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta),0}_{G;P}$ is a closed subset of $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta;\theta,0}_{G;P}$, and the latter is exactly the image of the map $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{p}^+_{aff}}$. Therefore, we have to calculate the $*$-restriction of

$$\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)} (\mathrm{Norm}_{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)})_*(\overline{\mathrm{Loc}}^{\mathfrak{P}(\theta)}(\mathfrak{V}_{\mathfrak{p}}))[|\mathfrak{P}(\theta)|]$$

to $\mathrm{Gr}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}} \subset \mathrm{Mod}^{\theta,+}_{M_{aff},\mathbf{C}}$, and as in the proof of Theorem 1.12 of [BFGM] we obtain the required answer for Theorem 16.8.

Type 2: We can assume that $P = G$ and we are dealing with the stratum $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}} \subset \mathrm{Sym}^a(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}) \subset \mathfrak{U}^a_G$.

By Theorem 16.7 we know the restriction of $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}$ to $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}} \subset \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, and we obtain

$$\underset{i}{\oplus}(\mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{V}^f))_a[2i] \otimes \underline{\mathbb{C}}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}}[2].$$

In particular, by passing to the category of mixed Hodge modules and retracing the proof of Theorem 16.7, we obtain that $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}|_{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{C}}}$ is pure.

However, since $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}|_{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}}$ is equivariant with respect to the group of affine-linear transformations of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}$, we obtain that $\mathrm{IC}_{\mathfrak{U}^a_G}|_{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}}$ is also pure, and hence semi-simple. Therefore, it is isomorphic to $\underset{i}{\oplus}(\mathrm{Sym}^i(\mathfrak{V}^f))_a[2i] \otimes \underline{\mathbb{C}}_{\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{S}}}[2]$, as required.

Finally, let us prove Theorem 16.5. In this case there are also two types of strata, not covered by the induction hypothesis: $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{\theta;\mathfrak{P}(\theta),0}_{G;P}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{U}}^{a\cdot\delta;0,a}_{G;P}$.

The assertion for the stratum of the first type follows from Theorem 16.3 just as the corresponding assertion for $\mathfrak{U}^{\theta}_{G,P}$ follows from Theorem 16.7. The assertion for the stratum of the second type follows from the corresponding fact for $\mathfrak{U}^a_G$, which has been established above.

18. Appendix

We recall the setup of Proposition 2.7. Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is symmetrizable. Then a stronger statement holds:

Theorem 18.1. *The scheme* $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ *is of finite type.*

We reproduce here the proof due to V. Drinfeld and A. Joseph. Recall that according to Proposition 2.7, $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ is a union of finite type open subschemes $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}), w \in \mathcal{W}$. We have to check that the above union is actually finite, i.e. for w big enough we have $\mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}) = \mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$. In other words, we have to find $w \in \mathcal{W}$ such that any map $\sigma \in \mathrm{Maps}^{\theta}(\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}})$ lands into the open subscheme $\mathcal{G}^w_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}$. We will give a proof for $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{b}$, and the general case follows immediately.

More precisely, for $\mu = \sum_{i\in I} n_i \cdot \alpha_i \in \Lambda^{pos}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ we set $|\mu| := \sum_{i\in I} n_i$. We will prove that the image of $\sigma(\mathbf{C})$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ never intersects Schubert subvariety $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}$ for $\ell(w) > 2|\mu|$ (the reduced length).

To this end note that $|\mu|$ is the intersection multiplicity of the curve $\sigma(\mathbf{C})$ and the Schubert divisor $\bigcup_{i\in I} \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},s_i}$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$. If $\sigma(\mathbf{C})$ passes through a point of $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}$, this intersection multiplicity cannot be smaller than the multiplicity of the Schubert divisor at this point. Thus it suffices to prove that the multiplicity of the Schubert divisor $\bigcup_{i\in I} \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},s_i}$ at a point of the Schubert variety $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}$ is at least $\frac{1}{2}\ell(w)$.

We choose $\check{\rho} \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\langle \alpha_i, \check{\rho} \rangle = 1, \ \forall \ i \in I$. Let $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\rho}}$ denote the simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module with highest weight $\check{\rho}$. For each $w \in \mathcal{W}$, let $v_{w\check{\rho}}$ denote an extremal vector in $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\rho}}$ of weight $w\check{\rho}$; let $v^*_{w\check{\rho}}$ be an extremal vector in $\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\rho}}$ of weight $-w\check{\rho}$.

Recall that under the projective embedding $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}^*_{\check{\rho}})$ the Schubert divisor $\bigcup_{i\in I} \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},s_i}$ is cut out by the equation $v_{\check{\rho}}$. There is a transversal slice to $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}$ through the T-fixed point w isomorphic to $w(\mathfrak{n}) \cap \mathfrak{n}^-$ (and the isomorphism is given by the action of the corresponding nilpotent Lie group), and in the coordinates $f \in w(\mathfrak{n}) \cap \mathfrak{n}^-$ the above equation reads

$$\langle v_{\check{\rho}}, \exp(f) v^*_{w\check{\rho}} \rangle = 0$$

where exp is the isomorphism between the nilpotent Lie algebra $w(\mathfrak{n}) \cap \mathfrak{n}^-$ and the corresponding Lie group.

Hence the multiplicity m_w of the Schubert divisor at the point $w \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},w}$ is the maximal integer m such that $\langle f_1 \dots f_m v_{\check{\rho}}, v^*_{w\check{\rho}} \rangle = 0$ for any $f_1, \dots, f_m \in w(\mathfrak{n}) \cap \mathfrak{n}^-$. Let F^n denote the canonical filtration on the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{n}^-)$. Now the desired estimate $m_w \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell(w)$ is a consequence of the following lemma belonging to A.Joseph. We are grateful to him for the permission to reproduce it here.

Lemma 18.2. *Suppose $v_{w\check{\rho}} \in F^m(U(\mathfrak{n}^-))v_{\check{\rho}}$. Then $2m \geq \ell(w)$.*

Proof. The proof uses the Chevalley-Kostant construction of $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\rho}}$ as extended in [J] to the affine case. The extension generalizes with no significant change for $\mathfrak{g}$ as above. The extension from the semisimple case (of Chevalley-Kostant) needs a little care as infinite sums are involved. A slightly more streamlined analysis is given in [GrJ]. Some details are given below.

Recall that $\mathfrak{g}$ admits a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form $(\ ,\ )$. From this one may construct the Clifford algebra $C(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ defined as a quotient of the tensor algebra $T(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ by the ideal generated by the elements $x \otimes y - y \otimes x - 2(x, y), \ \forall \ x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$.

One defines a Lie algebra homomorphism φ of $\mathfrak{g}$ into a subspace of certain infinite sums of quadratic elements of $C(\mathfrak{g})$. (See [J], 4.11 or [GrJ], 4.7). In this one checks that only finitely many commutators contribute to a given term in $[\varphi(x), \varphi(y)]$ which therefore makes sense and by the construction equals $\varphi[x, y]$ (cf. [GrJ], 4.7).

It turns out that we need to reorder the expression for $\varphi(x)$ so that only finitely many of the negative root vectors lie to the right. This process is well-defined for root vectors x of weight $\pm\check{\alpha}_i, \ i \in I$. This is extended to $\mathfrak{g}$ via commutation and the Jacobi identities (see [J], 4.11). Notably

$$\varphi(h) = \check{\rho}(h) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\check{\alpha} \in \Delta^+} \sum_r \check{\alpha}(h) e^r_{-\check{\alpha}} e^r_{\check{\alpha}}, \ \forall \ h \in \mathfrak{h}, \tag{35}$$

where Δ^+ is the set of positive roots, $e^r_{\check{\alpha}}$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\check{\alpha}}$ and $e^r_{-\check{\alpha}}$ a dual basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{-\check{\alpha}}$.

Through the diamond lemma one shows that $C(\mathfrak{g})$ admits triangular decomposition, that is to say there is a vector space isomorphism

$$C(\mathfrak{n}^-) \otimes C(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes C(\mathfrak{n}) \xrightarrow{\sim} C(\mathfrak{g})$$

given by multiplication. (The left hand side is defined by restricting the bilinear form: in particular $C(\mathfrak{n}^-) = \Lambda(\mathfrak{n}^-)$).

View $\mathfrak{n}$ as a subspace of $C(\mathfrak{g})$ and let $I(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the left ideal it generates. Through multiplication by $\varphi(x) : x \in \mathfrak{g}$, and the above ordering, it follows that $C(\mathfrak{g})/I(\mathfrak{g})$ becomes a $\mathfrak{g}$-module. By [J] 4.12 it is a direct sum of $\dim C(\mathfrak{h})$ copies of $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\rho}}$. In particular if $v_{\check{\rho}}$ is the image of the identity of $C(\mathfrak{g})$ in $C(\mathfrak{g})/I(\mathfrak{g})$, then $U(\varphi(\mathfrak{g}))v_{\check{\rho}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\rho}}$. (However it does not lie in $C(\mathfrak{n}^-) \pmod{I(\mathfrak{g})}$, only in $C(\mathfrak{n}^-) \otimes C(\mathfrak{h}) \pmod{I(\mathfrak{g})}$). (Note by (35) above, $v_{\check{\rho}}$ has weight $\check{\rho}$).

Given $w \in \mathcal{W}$, set $S(w^{-1}) = \{\check{\alpha} \in \Delta^+ \text{ s.t. } w^{-1}\check{\alpha} \in -\Delta^+\}$. Since $\check{\beta} \in S(w^{-1})$ is a real root there is a unique up to scalars root vector $e_{-\check{\beta}} \in \mathfrak{n}^-$ of weight $-\check{\beta}$. Since $C(\mathfrak{g})/I(\mathfrak{g}) \approx \Lambda(\mathfrak{n}^-) \otimes C(\mathfrak{h})$ as an $\mathfrak{h}$-module it follows that the subspace of $C(\mathfrak{g})/I(\mathfrak{g})$ of weight $w\check{\rho}$ is just

$$\left(\prod_{\check{\beta} \in S(w^{-1})} e_{-\check{\beta}}\right) C(\mathfrak{h}).$$

With respect to the canonical filtration F^n of $C(\mathfrak{g})$ such an element has degree between $\ell(w)$ and $\ell(w) + \dim \mathfrak{h}$. Yet $\varphi(\mathfrak{g}) \subset F^2C(\mathfrak{g})$ and $v_{\check{\rho}} \in F^0C(\mathfrak{g})$. The assertion of the lemma follows. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 18.1.

References

[B] R. Bezrukavnikov, *Perverse coherent sheaves (after Deligne)*, preprint math.AG/0005152.

[BBD] A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux Pervers*, Astérisque **100** (1982), 5–171.

[BaGi] V. Baranovsky, V. Ginzburg, Algebraic construction of the Uhlenbeck moduli space, manuscript (1998).

[BFGM] A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg, D. Gaitsgory, I. Mirković, *Intersection Cohomology of Drinfeld's compactifications*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **8** (2002), 381–418.

[BG] A. Braverman, D. Gaitsgory, *Crystals via affine Grassmannian*, Duke Math. J. **107** (2001), 561–575.

[BG1] A. Braverman, D. Gaitsgory, *Geometric Eisenstein series*, Invent. Math. **150** (2002), 287–384.

[CB] W. Crawley-Boevey, *Normality of Marsden-Weinstein reductions for representations of quivers*, Math. Ann. **325** (2003), no. 1, 55–79.

[Do] S. K. Donaldson, *Connections, cohomology and the intersection forms of four-manifolds*, Jour. Diff. Geom. **24** (1986), 275–341.

[DK] S. K. Donaldson, P. Kronheimer, *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs (1990).

[Fa] G. Faltings, *Algebraic Loop Groups and Moduli Spacesof Bundles*, Jour. Eur. Math. Soc. **5** (2003), 41–68.

[FFKM] B. Feigin, M. Finkelberg, A. Kuznetsov, I. Mirković, *Semi-infinite Flags*, The AMS Translations **194** (1999), 81-148.

[FGK] M. Finkelberg, D. Gaitsgory, A. Kuznetsov, *Uhlenbeck spaces for $\mathbb{A}^2$ and affine Lie algebra $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n$*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **39** (2003), no. 4, 721–766.

[FKMM] M. Finkelberg, A. Kuznetsov, N. Markarian, I. Mirković, *A note on a symplectic structure on the space of G-monopoles*, Comm. Math. Phys. **201** (1999), 411-421.

[Ga] D. Gaitsgory, *Construction of central elements in the affine Hecke algebra via nearby cycles*, Invent. Math. **144** (2001), 253–280.

[Gi] D. Gieseker, *On the moduli of vector bundles on an algebraic surface*, Ann. of Math. (2) **106** (1977), 45–60.

[GrJ] J. Greenstein, A. Joseph, *A Chevalley-Kostant presentation of basic modules for $\widehat{sl(2)}$ and the associated affine KPRV determinants at $q = 1$*, Bull. Sci. Math. **125** (2001), 85–108.

[J] A. Joseph, *On an affine quantum KPRV determinant at $q = 1$*, Bull. Sci. Math. **125** (2001), 23–48.

[Ka] M. Kashiwara, *The flag manifold of Kac-Moody Lie algebra*, in Algebraic Analysis, Geometry, and Number Theory, Proceedings of the JAMI Inaugural Conference, The Johns Hopkins University Press (1989), 161–190.

[Ka1] M. Kashiwara, private communication.

[Ka2] M. Kashiwara, *Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture for a symmetrizable Kac-Moody Lie algebra*, Progr. Math. **87** (1990), 407–433.

[Ka3] M. Kashiwara, *Crystallizing the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), 465–516.

[Ka4] M. Kashiwara, *Crystal base and Littelmann's refined Demazure character formula*, Duke Math. J. **71** (1993), 839–858.

[Ka5] M. Kashiwara, *On crystal bases*, CMS Conference Proceedings **16** (1995), 155–197.

[KaS] M. Kashiwara, Y. Saito, *Geometric construction of crystal bases*, Duke Math. J. **89** (1997), 9–36.

[KiP] B. Kim, R. Pandharipande, *The connectedness of the moduli space of maps to homogeneous spaces*, preprint math.AG/0003168.

[Li] J. Li, *Algebraic geometric interpretation of Donaldson's polynomial invariants*, Journal of Differential Geometry **37** (1993), 417–466.

[Mo] J. W. Morgan, *Comparison of the Donaldson polynomial invariants with their algebro-geometric analogues*, Topology **32** (1993), 449–488.
[Na] H. Nakajima, *Lectures on Hilbert schemes of points on surfaces*, The AMS University Lecture Series **18** (1999).
[Pe] N. Perrin, *Courbes rationelles sur les variétés homogènes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **52** (2002), 105–132.
[Th] J. F. Thomsen, *Irreducibility of* $\overline{M}_{0,n}(G/P,\beta)$, Internat. J. Math. **9** (1998), 367–376.
[U] K. K. Uhlenbeck, *Connections with* L^p *bounds on curvature*, Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), 31–42.
[Va] G. Valli, *Interpolation theory, loop groups and instantons*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **446** (1994), 137–163.

19. Erratum

Added in February 2006

19.1. We are grateful to Joel Kamnitzer for pointing out the following mistake in the paper:

Proposition 15.2 is wrong. Namely, the intersection

$$\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathfrak{F}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}} \tag{36}$$

may be reducible. Indeed, let μ be such that $\mathbf{K} \cap \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is dense in $\mathbf{K}$. However, it might happen that the intersection (36) contains an irreducible component $\mathbf{K}'$, such that $\mathbf{K}' \cap \mathbb{S}^{\mu',\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is dense in $\mathbf{K}'$ for $\mu' \neq \mu$. (J. Kamnitzer showed us a counter-example for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathsf{sl}_3$, $\alpha = \alpha_1 + 2\cdot\alpha_2$ and $i = 2$.)

Let us analyze separately the following two cases:

(1) The map $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}_i} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta}_{M_i}$ collapses $\mathbf{K}$ to a single point.

We claim that in this case, it is easy to see that the intersection (36) is empty. Indeed, the image of $\mathbf{K}$ is a point that lies in $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)} \subset \mathrm{Gr}_{M_i}$, and the intersection in question is the pre-image of $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{B^-(M_i)} \subset \mathrm{Gr}_{M_i}$.

(2) The map $\overset{\circ}{\mathbb{S}}{}^{\theta}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}_i} \to \mathrm{Gr}^{\theta}_{M_i}$ *does not* collapse $\mathbf{K}$ to a single point.

Then the image of $\mathbf{K} \cap \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ under this map is the (unique) irreducible component of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda}_{B^-(M_i)}$, of non-zero dimension. Hence, the intersection

$$\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$$

is non-empty and consists of the single irreducible component of dimension $\dim(\mathbf{K}) - 1$, equal to the preimage of the (unique) irreducible component of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mu}_{B(M_i)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{B^-(M_i)} \subset \mathrm{Gr}_{M_i}$. The closure of $\overline{\mathbf{K}} \cap \mathbb{S}^{\mu,\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{p}_i}$ in $\overset{\circ}{\mathfrak{F}}{}^{\lambda-\alpha_i}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ equals by definition $f_i^*(\mathbf{K})$; in particular $f_i^*(\mathbf{K}) \neq 0$.

Thus, instead of the erroneous Proposition 15.2 we have shown the following:

Proposition 19.2. *If the intersection* (36) *is non-empty, then* $f_i^*(\mathbf{K}) \neq 0$ *and it corresponds to an irreducible component of dimension* $\dim(\mathbf{K}) - 1$ *of* (36).

The implication Conjecture 15.3 $\Rightarrow$ Conjecture 2.27 remains valid.

A.B.: Dept. of Math., Brown Univ., Providence, RI 02912, USA;
M.F.: Independent Moscow Univ., 11 Bolshoj Vlasjevskij per., Moscow 119002, Russia;
D.G.: Dept. of Math., The Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
E-mail address:
braval@math.brown.edu; fnklberg@mccme.ru; gaitsgde@math.uchicago.edu